CURRENT NEWS EARLY BIRD

TUESDAY, April 21, 1998

New York Times April 21, 1998 Pg. 1

U.S., Britain Relocate Nuclear Material From Volatile Georgia

By Michael R. Gordon

MOSCOW -- The United States and Britain have begun a secretive operation to remove nuclear material from the volatile Caucasus nation of Georgia, Western officials say.

The supply of highly-enriched uranium and spent nuclear fuel is stored at a research reactor outside the Georgian capital of Tbilisi. It has been a serious concern for American officials, who feared it could fall into the hands of Chechen gangs, Iran, or another aspiring nuclear power.

The classified operation to remove the nuclear material, which is code-named Auburn Endeavor, also shows that the United States is now prepared to operate in former Soviet republics like Georgia.

When the Clinton administration proposed removing the material two years ago, it hoped to enlist Russian help and make the operation a model of American-Russian cooperation.

But after the Russians failed to make good on promises to accept the material, the United States went ahead with the operation anyway, though Washington did decide to inform Moscow.

The British played a vital role by volunteering to accept the cache, after the administration declined to move it to the United States because of potential challenges from American environmentalists.

Prime Minister Tony Blair approved the plan to store the nuclear material in Britain, reaffirming this to Clinton when he visited Washington in early February. British officials told their American counterparts that London considered the operation important enough to make an exception to its regulations against accepting foreign nuclear material.

The Americans also asked the French to take the material, but were rebuffed.

American military and civilian personnel are now in Tbilisi packing up the supply, which includes 8.8 pounds of highly-enriched uranium and 1.76 pounds of highly-radioactive spent fuel.

This week, U.S. Air Force transports will fly the nuclear cargo to Britain. It will then be taken to the Dounreay nuclear complex, in Scotland, which has the ability to reprocess spent fuel, removing the waste so the uranium can be reused.

Estimates vary about how much material is required to make a nuclear bomb. They depend on the skills of the bomb maker and the size of the explosive.

American officials say the material in Tbilisi, while substantial, would not be enough for a bomb. But private experts say that a skilled bomb maker could use it to make a weapon with a yield equivalent to 1,000 tons of TNT.

Virtually all experts, including the Georgians, believe that the nuclear material would be more secure if it was removed from the Caucasus.

The recent arrival of U.S. military transport aircraft in Tbilisi has sparked reports in the Georgian press that the long-stalled effort to remove the nuclear material finally appears to be under way.

The Tbilisi reactor's vulnerability has fed growing concern in the West and in Russia about how to protect the region's supply of nuclear weapons and the nuclear materials in the laboratories, power plants, and institutes spread through the former Soviet Union.

The United States and Russia have publicly embraced the goal of protection. But the Georgian case shows how diplomatic and bureaucratic impediments in the United States and Russia can impede the effort.

Georgia, which enjoys good ties with the West, has never had an interest in keeping the supply or beginning a program to develop nuclear weapons.

"Indeed, we have several kilograms of uranium," President Eduard Shevardnadze of Georgia said in a 1996 interview. "We need to get rid of it. But we can't do it independently."

The origins of the Tbilisi material go back to the days of Soviet power, when Moscow devoted huge sums to its nuclear complex. The research reactor was built outside Tbilisi

Good soldiers don't get exit benefits of misfits

Cohen told policy 'rewards' misbehavior

Washington Times...See Pg. 2

GREEN-COLLAR WORKERS: Life in the Peacetime Army

GI Janes on a career path

Chicago Tribune...See Pg. 3

War takes a vacation at 'Red Sea Riviera'

USA Today...See Pg. 6

This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...

PLEASE RECYCLE

in 1959 for Georgia's Institute of Physics.

After the 1986 Chernobyl disaster, the reactor was shut down because of safety concerns. That pleased environmentalists, but it left Georgia with a problem: what to do with the plant's nuclear material. The reactor used highly-enriched uranium as fuel, which is a valuable component in making nuclear weapons.

Georgia took some steps on its own to reduce its supply of highly-enriched uranium. It sent a small amount to Uzbekistan, which has a similar reactor. But that still left Georgia with a small supply of enriched uranium, as well as a smaller amount of spent fuel that could be refined into weapons-grade ingredients.

Over the years, Georgian officials say they have had many sleepless nights over the nuclear material. According to Georgian officials, the greatest danger occurred during the Georgian civil war in the early 1990s, when the Tbilisi reactor was virtually unprotected.

Georgian physicists were afraid that a paramilitary group might discover the supply and try to steal it. But the roving gangs apparently did now know of the supply or were simply content to steal cars from the reactor's parking lot.

In January 1996, the United States began to get into the act.

Specialists at the U.S. Energy Department sent the White House a classified letter, proposing that Washington work out an arrangement with the Georgians to take the material back to America.

There was a precedent for this type of operation. In 1994, the United States carried out a similar operation in Kazakhstan. Under "Operation Sapphire" more than half a ton of bomb-grade uranium was transported to the nuclear complex at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

But the the State Department was wary about starting an operation in the Russians' backyard without consulting Moscow. Other Clinton administration officials were afraid that taking the small amount of nuclear waste could rile environmentalists in the United States and result in legal challenges.

The once urgent operation was put on a slow track, as the United States sought to persuade the Russians to take the supply.

Confidential discussions were conducted in 1996 when Vice President Al Gore and other senior American officials met with the prime minister at that time, Viktor Chenomyrdin, and his top aides.

In early 1997, Russia's minister of atomic energy, Viktor Mikhailov, publicly promised to take the supply by March 1997. But the three-way negotiations between the United States, the Russians, and the Georgians remained stymied.

One sticking point was what to do with the spent fuel.

The Tbilisi reactor has only 1.76 pounds of spent fuel, which is highly reactive and stored in a cooling pond at the weather-beaten nuclear complex.

Georgia was unsuccessful in finding a nation to take this nuclear waste. During the Soviet era, Georgia shipped its spent fuel to the Russian nuclear complex at Chelyabinsk in the Ural Mountains.

But that arrangement came to an end after the breakup of the Soviet Union. The last trainload of spent fuel was shipped in March 1991.

The Russians have maintained that their laws prevent them from taking nuclear waste from foreign nations, even though Georgia is a former Soviet republic and its fuel was provided by the Soviet Union.

As the diplomats discussed the problems, the United States arranged for a costly alarm system to be installed at the Tbilisi reactor. Television cameras were stationed there and a wall of bricks was put up in front of the room storing the highly-enriched uranium so that there would be a measure of protection.

But American officials conceded that this was only a stop-gap measure.

A recent assassination attempt against Shevardnadze, in which his armored Mercedes was raked by gun fire, highlighted the potential instability in the country.

So this past fall, the White House began looking for a different plan. After several months of secret discussions with London, the British signaled that they were prepared to help, and a deal was struck to take the material to the Dounreay complex.

As part of the consultations, Clinton has also spoken with Shevardnadze.

Under the plan, American transports have flown from Europe to bring in fork lifts and other equipment to handle the material.

The highly-enriched uranium fuel is being put into special drums.

Packing the spent fuel is more problematic because it is highly radioactive. It has to be placed in a heavy cask, which weighs about 40 tons.

Georgia is to be paid about $125,000 for the material. Transport costs for the United States are about $2 million.

American officials acknowledge that it took a long time to deal with the problem, but insist that their diplomacy was successful.

"It is a successful example of multilateral diplomacy to counter a proliferation threat," said a senior Clinton administration official.

Washington Times April 21, 1998 Pg. 1

Good soldiers don't get exit benefits of misfits

Cohen told policy 'rewards' misbehavior

By Rowan Scarborough
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

When Uncle Sam doesn't want someone anymore because of drug addiction, alcoholism, obesity or homosexual conduct, the military can ease the way out with an attractive list of benefits.

But now, some in the cash-strapped military services are raising objections. They want to urge Defense Secretary William S. Cohen to curtail the 1991 program, according to an internal memo obtained by The Washington Times. The memo argues that it is "morally" unfair to heap housing and medical benefits on those discharged for behavioral or weight problems without offering the same exit gifts to people forced to leave before qualifying for retirement.

"Morally, the services can no longer justify why we are rewarding involuntarily separated 'for cause' personnel and letting those who have faithfully served 'walk' with little more than an [honorable discharge]," the memo said. The document was drafted by an Air Force personnel officer and circulated to the other branches.

The memo urges a summit of the Air Force, Army, Navy and Marine Corps, and Pentagon civilians, to recommend ways to end the perceived unfairness.

"The Air Force goal is to get the services in a forum and review the policy," said Maj. Stevi Shapiro, a service spokesman at the Pentagon. "There's been no decision made, and the policy stands the way it is."

The Pentagon could not immediately say how much money it spends on severance packages for the overweight, those who violate the homosexual ban or can't beat substance abuse. But defense sources say the services spend millions of dollars annually at a time when they say they need more

money to maintain combat readiness.

The Defense Manpower Data Center reports that 4,427 personnel were discharged in 1997 for being overweight, 5,817 for drugs, 1,559 for alcohol and 991 for homosexuality. In the past 10 years, the armed forces has kicked out more than 157,000 men and women for those reasons.

"This program rewards bad behavior," said retired Army Lt. Col. Robert Maginnis, an analyst at the Family Research Council. "Soldiers discharged for these reasons made bad choices and shouldn't be rewarded with taxpayer money . . . Homosexuals knew before enlisting that service was prohibited. Those with drug and alcohol problems are given treatment and plenty of time to recover, but if they fail, discharge is necessary for readiness reasons."

But C. Dixon Osburn, co-director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, said discharged homosexuals should be receiving more benefits, not less. "If you're kicked out for being gay you only get one-half separation pay," said Mr. Osburn, whose group aids those targeted under the homosexual ban. "It's our view that that is certainly punitive. People who are kicked out for being gay should not be doubly penalized. Here you've lost your job. They should not also be penalized financially as well."

Those discharged "for cause" receive benefits under the Transition Assistance Program (TAP). Congress created the package in 1991. TAP was primarily aimed at helping service members whose careers were stopped short by post-Cold War downsizing and who didn't serve long enough for retirement benefits.

BENEFITS ON TAP

The Pentagon's Transition Assistance Program, originally created for service members who didn't qualify for retirement benefits because of military downsizing, has also been offered to recruits who are discharged for a range of behavioral factors, including alcoholism and homosexual conduct. TAP benefits include:

- Medical and dental care
- Permissive leave to ease relocation efforts
- Shopping privileges at lower-cost military stores
- Household goods storage
- Separation pay for those discharged after serving between six and 20 years

Source: The Defense Department

The Washington Times

Pentagon civilians interpreted the law to cover not only personnel with clean records, but those forced out for behavioral problems. TAP is off limits to those separated for criminal misconduct or overall unsatisfactory performance.

A person who successfully serves a commitment and decides to leave the military doesn't receive TAP benefits.

According to the internal Air Force memo, the four military branches all opposed extending TAP to "for-cause" discharges.

"Fiscally, the services cannot nor should have to continue benefits to personnel never intended by Congress to receive them," the memo said. It said that in 1996 alone 2,200 airmen left the Air Force "for cause" and were eligible for TAP.

If the policy remains, the memo said, the military is "forced to 'live with' monetary burden and troops' perception that undeserving personnel are being rewarded and the resultant congressional inquiries and field disharmony."

The document said the package includes medical and dental care, privileges at lower-cost military stores, "permissive leave" to relocate and household-goods storage.

Those discharged are also eligible for separation pay if they have served at least six years — not 20 years, the point at which service members qualify for retirement benefits. Under TAP, for example, a 12-year Air Force captain who doesn't kick his drug habit would receive a lump payment of about $27,000.

Mr. Cohen's newest strategy study, the Quadrennial Defense Review, recommends extending TAP through 2003.

The Pentagon has cut the active force from 2.1 million to 1.4 million since the Berlin Wall fell in 1989.

"Soldiers with these problems have no place in the military to begin with," Col. Maginnis said, "and rewarding them for bad behavior sends the wrong message to service members who comply with the standards."

Chicago Tribune April 21, 1998

GI Janes on a career path

By F. Richard Ciccone
Tribune Staff Writer

FT. CARSON, Colo. -- The Humvee is what the modern Army rides to war. Sgt. Adrian McGrone keeps them running, but the last thing the Chicago native ever thought about the Army was that she would be going to war.

On Christmas 1990, she arrived in Saudi Arabia.

"I was terrified. All I could think was, 'What if I die? I didn't join the Army to die.'" she said.

McGrone, 28, a graduate of Jones Commercial High School who has been in the Army seven years, remained on duty in Desert Storm until June 1991. "You could hear the Scuds going over head. Three soldiers were hit and killed near our position."

None of the other nearly 73,000 women in the U.S. Army joined to die, either.

They joined for college money, opportunity and respect. Most of them are wives and mothers with a job that, for the most part, is much like any other American woman's. They complain about harassment and the glass ceiling. They shop at

NOTICE TO READERS

The Current News *Early Bird, Supplement, and Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at **http://ebird.dtic.mil.** Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

Wal-Mart and Gap. They are soccer moms and they are soldiers.

They do not enjoy going "to the field," and most of them are no more thrilled about getting up at 5 a.m. for physical training than many of their male counterparts. For some, the Army is no different from any other lifestyle in multicultural America of the 1990s. For others, it is a duty that takes priority over anything else in their lives.

Although there were women's branches of the military for decades, the inclusion of women alongside men in the Army began only 25 years ago. If the GI Janes have become comfortable in the military, the military, and much of American society, isn't necessarily comfortable with them.

Media coverage of the Tailhook scandal, shipboard pregnancies, rape allegations and the Kelly Flinn adultery charges reinforces the opinion that women present too many problems for the Army. The Army conducted a massive study released last September on harassment of women. The Pentagon has continuing debates about whether men and women should go through basic training together. The military periodically is criticized by feminist groups for its reluctance to provide greater combat responsibilities for women, which some say is the only way women will reach the top echelons of command.

The country is at best, ambivalent and at worst, scornful of women in the Army. There is a residual disdain for women entering what some see as a last and appropriate preserve of males.

What is missing from much of the public perception about women soldiers is that the Army offers opportunity and aspirations they insist they would not find in civilian life, and they doubt that their life is subject to any more discrimination or harassment than they would experience in the private workplace.

Many women soldiers applauded the fairness of the Army's promotion system, a meritocracy that they had not found in the civilian work force. Many women find the security of an Army career essential to raising a family. And few women soldiers say the Army prevents them from living in exactly the same way as their civilian neighbors and relatives.

Vanessa Warren wanted to be an actress. She still does community theater in Colorado Springs whenever the rehearsal schedules don't interfere with her job. Capt. Warren flies Blackhawk helicopters.

"I get amazed that people think what we do is unusual," she said. "It's just a job pattern. Our life is not about the military. Life doesn't revolve around the Army. We live just like everyone else except I'm gone some of the time."

Warren, who has been in the Army five years, is married to a computer programmer who works from their home. "When I'm gone, he misses me -- at least that's what he would tell you -- but he plays his computer games and orders pizza and he's fine. Actually he runs the household better than I do."

Almost all of America's women GIs could do in civilian life what they do in the Army, but many found it is easier to get what they want out of the Army and, in many cases, it is more rewarding.

"Opportunity, that's why I'm here," said Capt. Linda McKinney Wilson, head surgical nurse at Evans Army Community Hospital, a 190-bed facility that serves 50,000 patients annually at Ft. Carson.

"Before I came in, I worked at a hospital in Lake Charles, La. There was no opportunity to get an advanced degree. The pay in the Army is better than what I could make as a nurse."

McKinney Wilson spent seven years as an enlisted soldier before getting commissioned six years ago. She has a rare officer-enlisted marriage. Her husband is a sergeant and they married while both were in the enlisted ranks.

"I re-enlisted him and made sure he remembered the part about obeying superior officers," she laughed. "His friends tend to call me 'ma'am.'"

McKinney Wilson is not enthusiastic about everything in Army life. "I don't like PT (physical training). I don't like to go to the field. I won't like it when one of us is deployed, but I expect it."

She has two children, ages 10 and 5. The Army will pay for her advanced degree in pediatric nursing.

"There is so much more opportunity here," she said.

There are also women who joined the Army because it was not like a civilian job, because it was for a special breed, preparing for a special job. Sharon Leatherman is one of them.

"People come in here like it's a 9-to-5 operation. And it's not. No company will ever have to go to war, and their employees won't have to go out and kill people. Being a soldier is a 24-hour proposition. Once a soldier, always a soldier. There is a very different mentality now in the Army. The kids coming in today think you get off at 5 p.m. and that's it. They don't have to worry about when to stop drinking or what not to do," she said.

Leatherman, 30, is a warrant officer. She enlisted to "escape a boring hairdressing job" and doesn't like how she thinks the Army has changed in the 10 years since she joined.

"What you have nowadays is a bunch of crybabies coming into the Army. If you yell at them, they cry. If you raise your voice, they cry. When I joined the Army it was nothing like this. People weren't afraid to tell you when you did something wrong," she said. "Today, it's a different story. If you check someone's work today, they scream harassment. If you look over their shoulder, they scream race discrimination. It's absolutely crazy. These new kids think the world is theirs."

Mary Bodine is one of the new kids. "I love it here," said the 19-year-old who enlisted in 1996 after graduating from Maine South High School in Park Ridge. Bodine worked in the base public affairs office at Ft. Campbell, Ky., before being deployed to Europe.

She qualified for the Green to Gold program in which the Army promises to pay for four years of college and Bodine promises to serve eight years as a commissioned officer after graduating.

"I was all set to go (to college) but I had to defer when I was offered the opportunity to go to Hungary to write stories about the soldiers there. I'd be in college now but I couldn't pass up this opportunity," she said.

One of the reasons Bodine "loves it here" might surprise people who wonder about the physical safety of women GIs, not on the battlefield, but in an atmosphere dominated by men.

"It's so secure here. I was always afraid in Chicago. You never know what will happen. Here, everyone takes care of you. Everyone looks out for out you. I love the camaraderie. I love being part of a team," she said. "I never could feel this way in civilian life."

Bodine lives in modern Army quarters, coed dormitory-style barracks with two soldiers sharing a room. "It's not what you would call 'nice.' But I'm not a barracks rat, I'm never there."

The modern Army is not so modern as to have private bathrooms. "Community showers? Well, you get used to it," Bodine said.

Most of Bodine's friends are male soldiers, which is not surprising since the ratio of single males to single females is 2-1.

"The females don't socialize as a group. It's not a sorority. There really are not many single females. A lot of single women hook up with guys the minute they get here. I guess the guys are desperate," Bodine said. The nomadic life of the Army can be a negative for the single woman who doesn't "hook up."

Sharon Pierce, a master sergeant who plans to retire in 1998 after 20 years of service, remarried two years ago after being single in the Army for 10 years. "I never had a chance to build a relationship. I moved every 18 months," she said.

Dharl Fleet is one of the women who joined the Army with no interest in the $30,000 education package. She is a college graduate.

"I had a degree in journalism from San Marcos State (in Texas) but I couldn't get a job. I had no experience," she said. "I wanted a job like people used to have where you worked 50 years for a company and got a pension. I want to have three children. No way I could afford to raise three children as a civilian."

Fleet and her husband, also a specialist, married in Novem-

ber 1996 shortly after they signed their Army contracts.

"I love it here," she said. "I've never been happier in my life. I may stay enlisted as long as it keeps me in journalism. That's what I want to do. If that changes, or if there's a way to be an officer and stay in journalism, I might do it."

Fleet, 27, and her husband pay $300 a month rent for a farmhouse on 160 acres in Trenton, Ky., a short drive from Ft. Campbell.

"We both leave at 5:25 for PT and we're back to shower and change and say goodbye at 8 a.m. and then we're home at 5," she said. "It's just like everybody else. We get weekends off, we get leave. The military does a great job at making sure soldiers have family time like anyone else."

The reaction of Fleet's family to her decision to join the Army was similar to that reported by other women. "My dad couldn't believe his daughter was going into the army," she said. "He had this, 'We didn't raise our daughter to go in the Army and be treated like, well, you know . . .' As far as all the friends I used to have, I get some strange looks."

McKinney Wilson, who mostly socializes with civilian neighbors and church members, said, "Civilians always have lots of questions about the Army. They really don't understand it at all."

Many Americans have no idea of what women do in the Army or why they want to be there. Critics believe the presence of women has softened the Army. Proponents claim that after 25 years women are discriminated against in promotions and unduly harassed on their jobs.

Lt. Gilene Nez says it depends. "The Army treats you very differently as an officer," Nez said. "There is discrimination and harassment in the Army. I saw it as an enlisted person, even at AIT (advanced individual training). While I was there one of my fellow students broke down because she said that one of her supervisors was harassing her. She said he was slipping into the barracks and asking to sleep with her. (The Army) did a big investigation. That was the first time I saw it."

Nez said she was never sexually harassed.

Nez, 25, stumbled across ROTC (Reserve Officer Training Corps) in high school, dabbled in it for a few months, then during college entered the military to help pay her bills. She left the Army for three years, then returned when her funds once again ran low. It was during this current second stint that she saw the differences between being enlisted and being an officer.

"Everywhere I went, I had to prove myself as a soldier. They didn't think that women were their equals. So, I had to prove myself mentally and physically with every unit I joined. Then, once they accepted me, after I became one of the guys, they would talk about other females in front of me," she said.

"They would say stuff like, 'That soldier is getting pregnant on purpose.' Or they'd say, 'She drops out of the PT run all the time.' At first, as long as it wasn't me, I didn't care what they said. In most cases, I didn't say anything. But then after a couple of weeks of hearing this, I started to feel bad. It made me feel uncomfortable," Nez said. "Whenever you go to a new unit they look at you. It makes you wonder what they're saying about you."

Adrian McGrone has seen harassment but does not think it will hamper her Army ambitions.

"I've had some bad experiences but I've learned that people are going to be people no matter where you are at or what you are doing," she said. "You have to overlook them because they are not part of my big picture. I've met people who I don't get along with and have made my time at a certain place miserable. It happens. I can deal with anything for a short period of time.

"The Army is fair to the woman soldier. But there's still a boys' club," said McGrone, a motor pool dispatcher who supervises repairs of Army vehicles and the mechanics who fix them. "In a motor pool I work with a lot of men. I've been places where it's, 'We really don't want you,' and I've been in chain of commands where if you weren't a male they looked over you. But I've had so many good experiences that those people aren't going to deter me, they are not going to make me quit, they are not going to turn me to hate the Army."

"Before I was an E-4 (specialist/corporal) I wasn't given an even chance," she said. "But once I got to the E-5 board it was up to me and I made it easily. I think making E-6 (staff sergeant) will be easy because I have the record, and E-7 (sergeant first class) will follow shortly."

Because promotions to non-commissioned officer are based on points accrued for daily performance, education and special awards, a woman can easily track her chances of being promoted in her military occupational speciality.

Lt. Col. Stephanie Hewitt said she has never been aware of discrimination in the Army. "I guess I never worried about promotions or rewards," she said.

Hewitt, a native of Oregon who planned to be a teacher, was in the Air Force four years before joining the Army in 1981. Her career history indicates she never had to worry. She has been assigned to the NATO staff and the office of the Chief of Staff of the Army. At present she commands the 4th Personnel Service Battalion of the 43rd Area Service Group at Ft. Carson.

It is a prestigious assignment since there are not nearly enough commands to go around at the rank of lieutenant colonel, and many are relegated to staff positions for the remainder of their careers. Still, Hewitt concedes she is aware of what bothers many women Army officers and what has stirred criticism from women's advocacy groups and women former military leaders.

"The way it is now, no woman could ever be chief of staff of the Army. In that sense, there is a glass ceiling," she said.

"As long as women are restricted from combat positions, there will be no opportunity for women to rise to the highest ranks. The Army chief of staff position must have command combat experience. But as technology becomes more and more a part of combat, that may change. Women may serve in those areas sometime in the future, if our society changes its attitudes about women in combat," she said.

The Army restricts women from those military occupational specialities whose primary mission is to engage the enemy in direct ground combat. That means there are no women in the infantry, armored units or special forces.

Of nearly 11,000 women commissioned officers in the Army, 2,645 are in the Army Nurse Corps. Another 2,000 are in related medical services units, while 1,000 are assigned to intelligence or military police. Another 3,000 work in transportation, adjutant general, quartermaster and signal corps. Only 28 are in the field artillery, the likeliest ground units to serve close to a military front, and 265 are in aviation.

Among the more than 61,000 enlisted women, almost 20 percent work in administrative jobs and 30 percent work in medical and supply positions. Only 33 enlisted women are combat engineers and 89 are in field artillery. More than 2,000 work in mechanical maintenance.

Capt. Lisa Hedgepeth, 27, isn't bothered by restrictions. "I could rise to general ranks in the hospital corps," she said. "That's not my goal, but I know I could do it. I know there is a ceiling for women officers in the Army but there's a ceiling for women anyplace."

Hedgepeth, a native of Green Bay, graduated from St. Norbert College, where she was a member of ROTC, and spent three years in Germany with an ambulance platoon before her present assignment as commanding officer of the Hospital Medac Company, about 450 soldiers who work at Evans Army Community Hospital in Ft. Carson.

"I really tuned out when the Army recruiters visited us in high school but in college I got interested," she said. "I really loved field exercises (infantry training). I really believe that women will be in the infantry sometime in future."

Her family did not try to dissuade her from the military, "but they told me not to do it

for the money. I really didn't."

Hedgepeth, who is married to a captain in the military police, is not certain about the future, contemplating the difficulties like many of her civilian counterparts of balancing a career and a family. "I've had no long-term deployments. It's not very difficult right now because we don't have kids. If I'm gone for two weeks or he's gone for two weeks it's no big deal. But I don't know what it would be like raising children in the Army," she said.

Hedgepeth also goes along with the "kinder, gentler" Army when it comes to families: "If I have a single parent working for me who has a sick child and can't find anyplace to leave it, I give him or her the day off if they are good soldiers. You can't expect people to perform when they have those kinds of problems. They will pay you back by being better soldiers."

That, as Sgt. Brenda Jones realizes, is part of the change in the Army resulting from women holding command positions. Jones, a six-year veteran from Philadelphia, Miss., processes re-enlistments and has an administrative military occupational specialty. "Where I work, you don't have to worry about harassment or anything. So many of my superiors are women. It's like working in an office anyplace," she said.

Even the women who do not see their Army roles as impositions on their lives concede some frustration about the lingering male mystique.

Capt. Vanessa Warren said, "It is irritating when I call the post for services and someone asks, 'What is your husband's Social Security number?' "

She also said the Army has not learned to deal with male civilian spouses.

"My husband likes to play baseball but he couldn't play for the post team because he's not a soldier," she said. "He asked about it and they told him he could play on the spouses' softball team that's all women. He tried to explain that (he's a man) but he only got a bunch of blank looks. If you're a spouse in the Army you're supposed to a woman."

Warrant Officer Leatherman, who yearns for the restrictive disciplines of the old Army, is also experiencing some of disagreeable freedoms of the new Army. Leatherman, an African-American, said she has been has been accused of discrimination by males and females, as well as by individuals of different racial backgrounds. None of the complaints, all in recent years, she said, have stuck.

"There are a lot of women -- some men, too -- who decide if someone is giving them a hard time to file a harassment or discrimination suit," she said. "It's just a shame because I don't think they think about the impact their bogus complaints can have on someone's career. It can end it. And why? In most cases, because people don't like to be told what to do. Well, then you shouldn't have come in the Army. It's not for everyone."

Next: Why people join the Army

War takes a vacation at 'Red Sea Riviera'

USA Today
April 21, 1998
Pg. 7

The peace has held, even blossomed, for 16 years on the Sinai Peninsula between Egypt and Israel. Now some wonder whether the longest-running U.S. peacekeeping mission should be declared a mission accomplished.

By Andrea Stone
USA TODAY

SHARM EL SHEIKH, Egypt — The longest-running U.S. peacekeeping mission isn't in Bosnia or the Persian Gulf. It's here in Egypt, on the sun-drenched southern tip of the Sinai Peninsula along some the of world's most magnificent coral reefs.

The 16-year-old mission, which involves troops from 11 countries, is considered extraordinarily successful and extraordinarily peaceful. The force, whose job is to watch for peace treaty violations along the Israel-Egypt border, rarely reports a boat, plane or troop movement crossing a line.

But now that this part of the world has been made safe for scuba divers, some experts on the Middle East are beginning to ask: Is it time for troops to leave the "Red Sea Riviera"?

U.S. soldiers have been stationed here since April 25, 1982. That's when Israel withdrew its troops from Sinai, which it had captured from Egypt during the 1967 Middle East War. During what became known as the Six-Day War, Israel also captured the West Bank, the Golan Heights and the Gaza Strip. It occupies all those territories today.

Israel withdrew from Sinai under the terms of the Camp David Accordds with Egypt. That basic agreement, brokered by President Jimmy Carter at his official Maryland retreat in 1978, resulted in a peace treaty after four more years of negotiations. The United States provides about half the 1,900 troops known as the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO).

Defense Secretary William Cohen visited the troops Friday on a stop during a five-day, five-country trip.

'This is one of the safe streets'

The Middle East is "a dangerous neighborhood," Cohen said in a speech to soldiers from the 82nd Airborne Division, which is now serving a six-month tour here. "By virtue of your presence, this is one of the safe streets."

The mission is "symbolic more than anything else at this point, but it's an important symbol" of peace in the region, Cohen said in an interview as his trip began.

Asked whether he agreed with those who say it may be time to reconsider the arrangement, he said it was "an issue worth raising" with Egyptian and Israeli leaders. But after his meetings with them, he did not say whether they had discussed it.

Thirty years ago, this was a treeless, roadless military outpost lacking people and fresh water. Today, thanks to Egyptian developers, Sharm El Sheikh and nearby Nama Bay are lined with dozens of beachside hotels catering to Europeans and a few Israelis.

Wild camels, scorpions and lizards still are plentiful here. So are restaurants and swimming pools. There is a casino, a golf course, a bowling alley and even an ice skating rink. McDonald's is here, and a Hard Rock Cafe is planned.

In the middle is the MFO's South Camp, one of two bases here. New condominiums rise just beyond its razor wire. Soldiers assigned to observe three Egyptian patrol boats docked

at Sharm must find them among diving boats and cruise ships. At the airport near an observation post where soldiers search the sky for military aircraft, 15 to 20 tourist-filled planes land each day.

"This isn't a very hostile area," says Staff Sgt. David Hodges, 29, of Bath, Maine. "Out on patrol in Haiti, I was very worried. It was very dangerous. But here I'm not totally stressed."

Little fear of another war

Dan Smith, a former Army colonel, says the mission is too great a luxury for his old service, now that the Army has been reduced by more than a third since 1982. "Sending any active forces to the MFO is, in my view, a misuse of troops," says Smith, now with the Center for Defense Information, a think tank on military issues.

The mission is "probably getting close to outliving its usefulness," says John Tillson of the Institute for Defense Analysis, which does research for the Pentagon. "I don't think anybody thinks Egypt and Israel are going to war again."

The Camp David negotiators provided no timetable for withdrawing troops, and neither Israel nor Egypt is eager to see them pack up. Since the Israeli-Palestinian peace talks stalled, relations between the two nations have not been as warm as they were when Egypt's Anwar Sadat and Israel's Menachem Begin clasped hands. But during the past 20 years, the countries have developed economic ties and enjoy one of the more cordial relationships in a tense region.

The MFO is "like a kid's security blanket," says Lawrence Korb, a former Pentagon official. "Nobody wants to pull it away because nobody knows what's going to happen if you do."

"This was a no-man's land," says Kenneth Pollack of the Washington Institute for Near East Affairs, a think tank that sometimes tilts toward Israel. "Now it's a tourist destination. People are confident in the peace."

Future development isn't likely to be limited to the tip of Sinai. Developers have bought almost all the shoreline property from Sharm to Eilat, Israel, on the Gulf of Aqaba.

"When the MFO mission is completed, (South Camp) is going to be one incredibly valuable hunk of property," says Army Maj. William Winnewisser, who monitors Sinai from the Pentagon.

Cohen was impressed. "My image of the Sinai was not quite what I see today," he told troops. "It's really an extraordinary sight to see the kind of development taking place that's only possible if there is peace."

Yet deadly reminders of the region's bloody history lie hidden in the sands. Millions of land mines left over from two world wars and four Arab-Israeli wars remain buried throughout Sinai. In the past three years, five tourists have been killed within a few miles of here when they ignored warning signs and drove or hiked off the main roads.

Far from Sharm's dive shops, infantry troops from Fort Bragg, N.C., live in air-conditioned wooden trailers along the Gulf of Aqaba. Like the Fijian and Colombian soldiers who monitor zones along the northern border with Israel, they hunker in remote desert observation posts, looking for unauthorized Egyptian troop activity or Israeli jet flights or ship movements. Groups of 10 soldiers rotate 23 days of observer duty with 23 days of training and relaxation at base camp.

"It's fairly boring," Winnewisser says. "Nothing's happened in 15 years. Nothing's going to happen."

No soldier has died from hostile fire since the operation began.

The MFO is a relatively cheap effort; it cost the United States $16 million this year. By comparison, President Clinton asked Congress last month for $2.35 billion for peacekeeping operations in Bosnia through the end of next year.

The Sinai mission is a small price to pay for peace, says Middle East analyst Richard Haas of the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. "Any change would probably be interpreted as a sign that we had given up on the peace process," he says. "Those troops are symbols of U.S. support of the peace. If it's a small investment and the peace is holding, why do anything to change it?"

European Stars & Stripes April 21, 1998 Pg. 4

Cohen endorses Israeli offer to leave Lebanon

JERUSALEM (AP) — U.S. Defense Secretary William Cohen urged Lebanon and Syria on Monday to respond positively to Israel's proposal to pull its troops out of southern Lebanon.

"It's an important initiative, and I think it is a first step," Cohen told reporters after meeting with Israeli Defense Minister Yitzhak Mordechai in Jerusalem. Cohen made a one-day stop in Israel as part of a Mideast tour that also took him to Egypt, Turkey and Jordan. The trip is intended to demonstrate U.S. support for Israel's security and the struggling peace process and to shore up regional cooperation for containing Iraq.

Cohen noted that the United States supports improving Israel's defenses with a third battery of Arrow 2 missiles. The United States has contributed about $250 million so far toward the joint U.S.-Israeli program intended to defend against Scud missile attacks like those Iraq unleashed on Israel in the Persian Gulf War.

But Cohen added, "Another key to Israel's continued security is an achievement of a comprehensive peace."

"It is not enough for Israel to win wars, although that's critical," he said. "It must also win peace to achieve lasting security."

Israel's Cabinet earlier this month formally accepted a 20-year-old U.N. resolution calling for an Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon. Before withdrawing, however, Israel wants assurances that Lebanon will deploy its army in the south and prevent Shiite Muslim Hezbollah guerrillas from attacking northern Israeli settlements. Israel first invaded Lebanon in 1978 and in 1985 established the "security zone" it still occupies today.

Lebanon and Syria, the de facto power in Lebanon, have rejected linking any conditions to a pullout. Syria does not want an agreement on Lebanon separate from a deal to return the Golan Heights, which Israel captured in the 1967 Mideast war.

Cohen, asked if the United States would pressure Syria to accept Israel's proposal, said, "I'm not sure the United States is in a position to put pressure on any country. "But I have indicated to the minister that I believe his proposal is something that Syria and Lebanon should respond positively to," he said.

USA Today April 21, 1998 Pg. 7

U.S. sells more anti-missile arms to Israel

JERUSALEM — Defense Secretary William Cohen, meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Defense Minister Yitzhak Mordechai on Monday, said the United States had agreed to Israel's request for a third Arrow missile defense battery.

The Arrow development project began a decade ago and accelerated after Iraq fired 39 Scud missiles at Israel during the 1991 Gulf War.

The system, at a total price tag of $1.6 billion, is expected to be operational by 1999.

Cohen wraps up a six-day, five-nation trip to the Middle East and southern Europe today when he visits Athens. He

will discuss Greece's long-standing dispute with Turkey over the island of Cyprus and other issues. Before visiting Israel, Cohen made stops in Turkey, Jordan and Egypt. It is his first trip to the region since becoming Pentagon chief.

Israel is the top recipient of U.S. military aid — $1.8 billion a year.

Cohen also laid wreaths at Israel's Holocaust memorial and the grave of slain prime minister Yitzhak Rabin.

Richmond Times-Dispatch April 21, 1998 Pg. 4

Arab nations to sign anti-terrorism agreement

CAIRO, Egypt — After years of debate, Arab countries have agreed to cooperate to fight terrorism, Egypt's Middle East News Agency reported yesterday.

The agreement excludes attacks on Israel from its definition of terrorist acts.

The pact is to be signed at a meeting of interior and justice ministers from the 22-member Arab League in Cairo tomorrow.

The news agency quoted a report issued yesterday by a committee of the ministers, which said the pact has been accepted by all Arab countries.

Washington Post April 21, 1998 Pg. 13

Arafat, Netanyahu Agree on Talks

Blair Announces London Meeting, Cites Leading U.S. Role

By Doug Struck
Washington Post
Foreign Service

JERUSALEM, April 20— Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat and Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu have agreed to convene in London in two weeks, ending a long silence between the two and giving Europe new status in the efforts to advance Middle East peace.

British Prime Minister Tony Blair announced the May 4 meeting after conferring with Arafat today in the Gaza Strip and with Netanyahu in Jerusalem on Sunday.

Blair will defer to the American preeminence in the peace process. The invitations to the London meeting were officially issued by Washington today, and the two Middle East leaders will meet with Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright.

"We have made it clear all the way through that the United States should be in the lead," Blair said in Gaza.

The format of the meeting has not yet been worked out, but the initial plans still seem like those of a hostile and estranged couple: Arafat and Netanyahu may meet separately with Albright, and only then decide if they will all meet together.

The effort required even for this arrangement is evidence of the distress of the peace process, which is supposed to be proceeding with Israeli withdrawals from the West Bank under a timetable already signed by the two sides. There has been no progress in more than a year, and none is guaranteed to emerge from a conference in London.

Still, the announcement was a coup for Blair, given the failures of Albright and even President Clinton to get any movement from the parties. Britain has openly sought a role in the Middle East amid growing criticism that the United States is too close to Israel to apply the pressure necessary to persuade the Jerusalem government to carry out signed peace accords it opposes.

Blair, fresh from a successful role in helping bring about a proposed agreement in Northern Ireland, is on a five-day trip through the Middle East.

Britain holds the rotating presidency of the 15-nation European Union, but would not "cut across" the efforts in the region by the United States, Blair stressed.

He said, however, that the European Union might help the two sides reach agreement on subsidiary issues such as the opening of the completed Palestinian airport in Gaza and an industrial park there.

In Washington, a State Department spokesman said the London meeting will determine if there is "a basis for a breakthrough."

The United States has proposed that Israel withdraw from an additional 13 percent of the territory of the West Bank as the second of three agreed-upon stages of withdrawal.

Netanyahu reportedly has offered only a withdrawal from 9 percent more of the land and insisted it is the last such pullout before the "final" negotiations, which are expected be prolonged.

The Palestinians already have limited authority over about 27 percent of the West Bank, although Israeli army patrols continue to exercise "joint" responsibility over much of that land.

Netanyahu frequently has proposed a meeting with Arafat, but the Palestinian leader has objected, saying it would allow Israel to give the appearance of motion in the peace process while producing no action.

Arafat repeated his complaint today. "He gives promises to every world leader he meets," he said of Netanyahu. "He has never carried out any of those promises."

Netanyahu, in return, has complained that Arafat has not fulfilled obligations to try to stop terrorism or to gain repeal of Palestinian charter references to the destruction of Israel.

Various emissaries have worn a path between the two leaders. U.S. special envoy Dennis Ross is to return this weekend to meet both men. Defense Secretary William S. Cohen made a one-day stop in Israel today.

Blair's achievement almost was upstaged by Netanyahu. After the two men emerged from their talks Sunday night, Netanyahu apparently surprised Blair by announcing his willingness to "go anywhere, at any time, and specifically in the next month . . . possibly to London" to meet Arafat. Blair wanted to confer with Arafat before any announcement of the plan was made.

In the Gaza Strip today, Blair visited the Beach Refugee Camp, in which 50,000 Palestinians live in cramped and impoverished conditions.

He visited a family with 13 children, and promised that Britain would do its best to help resolve the half-century old Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Special correspondent Saud Abu Ramadan in Gaza contributed to this report.

US warns Saddam over UN inspectors

London Times
April 21, 1998

From Tom Rhodes
in Washington

THE United States issued an implicit warning to President Saddam Hussein last night, harshly accusing Iraq again of failing to observe United Nations mandates over weapons inspections.

In some of the strongest language employed against Baghdad since the most recent crisis was resolved in February, the State Department accused the regime of continuing to lie about weapons and said the time when UN sanctions against Iraq could be lifted was

"far away".

A report circulated in New York last week by Richard Butler, head of the UN Special Commission (Unscom), offered a pessimistic account of how the Iraqis had behaved since signing the UN-Iraq Memorandum of Understanding, the document that marked the end of the recent showdown.

"The report indicates there is a compelling case that Iraq has not complied with UN Security Council resolutions in any area of substance," said Jamie Rubin, the State Department spokesman. "It presents clear and very disturbing evidence that Iraq has failed to cooperate in coming forward with the information needed to allow the UN to conclude that Iraq has indeed destroyed the weapons it says it has destroyed."

Mr Rubin said that in the seven years since the Gulf War, the UN and the International Atomic Energy Agency had continually attempted to make the Iraqis provide complete, verifiable accounting of the weapons programmes.

The latest report appeared to confirm the Administration's worst suspicions about Saddam. President Clinton said two months ago that any signs of non-compliance would be countered by swift action from the United States.

"The message from all of this is that even while the Iraqis may have allowed inspectors to visit palaces, they continue to lie and hide the truth regarding the existence of long-range ballistic missiles, VX and sarin chemical weapons, and anthrax and other biological weapons," Mr Rubin said.

Washington Post April 21, 1998 Pg. 1

Iraq's Cowed Shiites Lose Zeal for Rebellion

By Doug Struck
Washington Post
Foreign Service

KARBALA, Iraq—The walls are whitewashed now, erased of the bloody handprints that told of death. The hypnotic blue tiles of the al-Abbas mosque are repaired, and President Saddam Hussein gave the gold to re-gild the shrine, pummeled when his tanks put down a revolt after the Gulf War.

Seven years after a fight-to-the-death uprising in southern Iraq, the Iraqi government has rebuilt the flattened buildings of the rebels' last stand and tightened its stranglehold on the region.

Here and in other cities of the south, the zeal that fed a revolt against Saddam Hussein's regime after the allied bombs stopped has been replaced by the weary struggle of daily life in an impoverished, sweltering land. Only a museum of the macabre in a side room of the al-Abbas shrine in Karbala tries to preserve evidence of the fierce fighting. But even the strange track of aluminum windows laid end-to-end on the floor over blood from the rebels' victims has not kept the red stains from fading.

Shiite Muslims who embraced the revolt have now learned their lines: "Karbala is heaven," said Hassan Ali Hamsa, 50, sitting near a hotel built over his property that was destroyed and then confiscated by the government. "Everybody loves the government," he insisted.

"The government has rebuilt us: roads, bridges, everything," said Mothena Jaffer, a freezer merchant in Basra, Iraq's southernmost city. "There is no more anger here. We have a saying, 'Live and let die.' "

Any hope that international isolation and the squeezing economic boycott of Iraq will create a popular revolt against Saddam Hussein appears ever more wishful thinking by the West. The CIA-sponsored resistance movement among Kurds in the north collapsed 20 months ago at the cost of millions of dollars and hundreds of lives, forcing a hasty evacuation of 7,000 collaborators and their families to Turkey and the United States.

And in southern Iraq, Shiite Muslims have no more taste for open revolution. They had watched, incredulous, as the U.S.-led allied forces allowed Saddam Hussein's helicopter gunships to mow them down in 1991, and they are resigned to the reign of the Iraqi president. "There are no signs of opposition," a veteran diplomat said in Baghdad. "There's no sign of it, no symptom of it."

With good reason. The U.N. Commission on Human Rights reported this month the Iraqi regime recently executed 1,500 political prisoners, giving credence to claims by Iraqi opposition groups in London that Saddam Hussein's son Qusay has ordered a "cleansing" of overflowing jails by shooting and electrocution.

"Saddam is for keeps here," said an Asian diplomat. "With every crisis he consolidates power. He has become a national hero for 'beating' the Americans."

Still, Saddam Hussein does not trust the goodwill of his people. The roads from Baghdad to Basra bristle with a show of force. There are scores of army checkpoints and military encampments, tents and gun emplacements baking in the sun. In Basra, a line of military statues points across the river to the traditional enemy Iran, but on the road to Basra the guns are pointed within.

The Shiite Muslims make up 65 percent of Iraq's population, but have long been a repressed and suspect majority. An early schism in Islam produced two main branches of the faith; the Sunni Muslim minority in Iraq -- and for many years, the West -- has long been wary of the spreading religious fervor from Shiite Iran. The 1991 rebellion briefly threatened to unite the Shiites in Iraq with their co-religionists in Iran, which could have further splintered Iraq, a country of tribal loyalties held together in Saddam Hussein's grip.

To reward the south's newfound loyalty, Saddam Hussein has rebuilt the mosques that are central to the Shiites, and refurbished towns damaged in fighting. A new canal from the Euphrates and a water purification plant recently brought potable water to Basra for the first time.

"Now I can wash my face. Before, even soap wouldn't clean us," said Jabber Ali, 31, a tea merchant. "And we don't have to buy water to drink. We are very grateful."

There are other longstanding problems. Electrical power in the south is still weak and unreliable, running at only about 40 percent of needs, and a recent U.N. report said that unless billions are invested in electrical generation no widespread improvements will be made to water purification, sewage treatment, or reduction in waterborne disease.

Medical care remains a problem, as throughout Iraq. Medicine is scarce, hospitals lack staff and basic equipment. Mortality is high. The weak perish. The tiny baby in the rundown "preemie" ward in the Saddam Hussein Hospital for Children in Karbala probably will not make it. The old woman begging in the street will catch an infection and die.

These casualties do not threaten the Iraqi leader's rule. On the contrary, the deaths are propaganda windfalls, used by Iraq to graphically illustrate what they portray as the evils of sanctions, which, indeed, kill the weakest and most vulnerable.

Southern Iraq has long carried a heavy share of this burden. It is poor, visited by disease, and host to regular warfare since the seventh century. Imam Ali, cousin of the prophet Mohammed, defeated two of his relatives nearby and paused to call Basra "an accursed place."

It is still dangerous. In rural areas, highway bandits prowl the roads. Drivers do not venture out at night, and the government, with some reluctance, has sought help from local tribal leaders to curb the crime.

Basra was the front line of the Iran-Iraq war, which claimed 1 million lives between 1980 and 1988. Two years later, Iraqi troops rumbled through Basra to invade Kuwait, just 90 miles away, and returned after Operation Desert Storm. The routed tide of humiliated soldiers walking back to Iraq joined with local Shiites

and some Iranian fighters, and staged a revolt that was merciless in its birth and was shown no mercy at its death.

When a correspondent visited Karbala after the revolt failed in 1991, the pools of caked blood underneath nooses in the al-Abbas shrine marked where 73 government and party members were hanged by the revolutionaries. Rooms that stank of death and carried the signature of bloody handprints suggested the brutal response of Saddam Hussein's regrouped Republican Guard.

Now, people here rewrite the past. The damage all was done by the Americans and other Zionist allies, people in Karbala and Najaf will suggest. If pressed about what they call the "Phase of the Traitors," they assert it was a conflict perpetrated by Iranians who came across the border.

The Iraqi woman in the black chador in Karbala knows otherwise. "My husband was taken on 19 of March, 1991, because of the resistance," she said, gripping the veil across her mouth in Muslim modesty. "The government came to search our house, and took him away. We have heard nothing since then. It is very hard. We have no money. My children have no father," she said.

The travails of their daily life, Iraqis insist, would disappear if the West would end its campaign to topple Saddam Hussein and let the United Nations remove the embargo.

"The problem is not with Iraq. The problem is with the United Nations," said Basra Archbishop. Djibrael Kassab, head of a tiny Catholic community in southern Iraq. "Believe me, these sanctions do not hurt me. They do not hurt Saddam Hussein. They hurt the people who are very poor."

Dirt poor. The southern countryside is largely a treeless place of mud-brick houses, barefoot children, donkeys and dogs. The sun seizes the land, baking strength into the houses and robbing it from the people.

Sitting on mats on the dirt floor in a rural area outside Basra, Mohammed Sayeed, 63, said his family of seven children and 23 grandchildren have only occasional small income from odd jobs. One of his sons is building a boat to take to the Shatt al Arab waterway to try fishing, but he does not know where he will get the money for a motor.

"If it weren't for the ration food, we would not survive," Sayeed said.

All Iraqis now rely on the monthly food ration begun by the government soon after sanctions were imposed, and increased slowly after May 1996, when Iraq and the United Nations reached agreement on a "food for oil" program allowing Iraq to sell $2 billion worth of oil every six months to pay for for food and medicine.

The food basket contains no meat or animal proteins, and at 2,000 calories a day, is just enough for sustenance, according to the World Food Program. But if poor families can raise a few chickens to eat, grow some extra vegetables, or catch a fish in the declining marshes of the south, their life, ironically, is more stable than it traditionally has been.

Saddam Hussein is taking away the fishing. A huge project to drain the marshes is being done to boost agriculture, the government says. Others say it is to rid the ancient, long-independent Marsh Arabs of their base, and many say the project will be an ecological nightmare.

But the United Nations and others say Saddam Hussein's food distribution program has been efficient and largely fair, and the south is treated equally with other regions.

"We can say with assurance that 99.5 percent of the population has access to the food basket," said Eric Falt, a spokesman for the U.N. humanitarian effort in Baghdad.

"We all depend on this system," said Latiffa Hassen, 40, a widow at Basra's food distribution shop. She spends each morning on the sidewalk, reselling nuts and dried lemons, but that does not give her enough to eat, she said. "This ration is our food. Praise Allah for the government."

Mass graves searched for war crime evidence

London Times April 21, 1998

From Tom Walker
in Banja Luka

FRESH exhumations of mass grave sites around Srebrenica, scene of the Bosnian war's worst massacre, were begun yesterday by a team of international forensic scientists. United Nations officials said they believed the teams would unearth "significant evidence" to bolster the prosecution of war crimes suspects.

Serb forces under the command of General Ratko Mladic overran Srebrenica in the summer of 1995, and up to 7,000 Muslims, mostly men, are missing, presumed dead.

Investigators are hoping that information gleaned from the newly uncovered graves can be used to strengthen the cases against General Mladic and his political mentor, Radovan Karadzic.

Both are still at large although charged with genocide and crimes against humanity by the United Nations War Crimes Tribunal in The Hague. Dr Karadzic is thought to be in Bosnia still, while General Mladic is supposed to be in hiding in Serbia.

Yesterday's exhumations involved a multinational team of 50 forensic scientists. Protected by UN Stabilisation Force troops, their work focused on a plateau near the Brnice dam, above the town of Zvornik, 20 miles northwest of Srebrenica on the Drina river.

"It's macabre to say, but now is the exhumation season," said a diplomat working for the Office of the High Representative. "It has a lot to do with the weather, but there are many other factors too, not least of which is the new climate of political co-operation in Bosnia."

He said more forensic scientists were at work at other sites, notably near the northern sector of the boundary line separating Bosnian Serb and Muslim-Croat territory. He identified a "constellation" of mass graves around the western town of Bosanski Petrovac.

Since exhumations began after the Dayton peace accord in 1995, more than 1,000 bodies have been found in Bosnia. The International Committee of the Red Cross has a list of 18,000 people missing from the war, but each side has different estimates and conflicting means of researching and presenting data.

The exhumations are under the overall charge of Carlos Westendorp, the High Representative to Bosnia, but are conducted by the International Committee for Missing Persons, supported by the Red Cross and Physicians for Human Rights.

"The digging will go on for many years, and we get new reports of mass graves every day," said a High Representative official. "Some of it is accurate, some of it is very vague." The exhumations around Bosanski Petrovac are expected to uncover Serb victims of Muslim massacres.

The Srebrenica operation is costing £1.7 million, with America, Britain, Canada, Denmark and Saudi Arabia the main donors. The town and the surrounding Podrinje region was predominantly Muslim before the war, but are now in eastern Bosnian Serb territory.

Dr Karadzic is said to be compiling his own account of his role in the war, which he is sending to the tribunal in The Hague through lawyers in Belgrade. It is thought the Karadzic dossiers are likely to implicate Slobodan Milosevic, the Serbian political supremo and now President of Yugoslavia, who Dr Karadzic claims gave him direct orders.

Dr Karadzic is thought to live in fear not only of Stabilisation Force "snatch squads", but also of assassins sent into Republika Srpska by Mr Milosevic.

Serbs Flee Kosovo Village After Armed Raid

New York Times April 21, 1998

By Reuters

PRISTINA -- More than 120 Serbian families fled a village in southwestern Kosovo Province after their homes came under gunfire and grenade attack during the night, the Serbian-run Pristina media center reported .

The village, six miles from the Serbian province's border with Albania, is in an area where guerrillas of the separatist ethnic Albanian Kosovo Liberation Army are strong.

The center said the villagers took refuge in a hospital in a nearby town and that armed Albanians prevented Serbs from other nearby villages from joining them. The families were from the village of Babaloc, and they later returned home.

Incidents along the border have multiplied since a Serbian police crackdown on suspected separatist strongholds in Kosovo in which at least 80 Albanians died in February and early March.

The Yugoslav Army, which patrols the border, accused Albanian authorities last week of helping to smuggle arms to the Kosovo Albanians, who make up 90 percent of the 1.8 million population of the province.

Baltimore Sun April 21, 1998 Pg. 1

U.S. panel urges better oversight of ship disposal

Board does not seek program overhaul, ban on scrapping overseas

'Timid,' Mikulski says

By GARY COHN
SUN STAFF

WASHINGTON — A Defense Department panel called yesterday for more rigorous management of the government's troubled ship-scrapping program, but stopped short of recommending the overhaul urged by critics.

The panel suggested that government agencies step up inspections and provide clearer guidance about the safe disposal of vessels in the United States. But the panel did not rule out scrapping ships overseas, where worker safety and environmental regulation is virtually nonexistent. The panel's report provoked immediate criticism from Congress.

"The panel's recommendations are tepid and timid," said Sen. Barbara A. Mikulski. "The panel had an opportunity to change the way we dispose of our Navy ships. Instead, they tinker with the problem without solving it."

The Maryland Democrat said she planned to introduce legislation that would require the Navy to use shipyards in the United States to dismantle ships safely and ban overseas sales of old government ships for scrapping.

Rep. Wayne T. Gilchrest, a Maryland Republican whose House maritime subcommittee held a hearing on the scrapping program last month, said yesterday that he would call for another hearing.

The Defense panel was created in December after the shipbreaking industry came under increasing pressure from lawmakers and environmentalists to comply with anti-pollution and worker-safety laws. The scrutiny began after *The Sun* documented the industry's record of deaths, accidents, fires, mishandling of asbestos and environmental violations while dismantling Navy ships at ports around the country.

The Navy and the Maritime Administration together have about 180 old ships awaiting scrapping. The panel was concerned about the need to accelerate the pace of scrapping, because the Navy's storage facilities are near capacity and some Maritime Administration vessels are at risk of sinking.

One of the key issues addressed by the panel was whether to retain the current system, in which private contractors buy old ships from the government and hope to make a profit by selling the salvaged metal. In the 1990s, though, many contractors cut corners, leading to safety and environmental violations at ports including Baltimore.

A number of reputable companies have said they won't bid for government ships because the costs of safely scrapping the vessels — laden with asbestos and other hazardous materials — are so high. But the panel rejected the argument that the only way scrapping will be done properly is to subsidize the program.

"There's nothing the panel reviewed that showed it couldn't be a profit-making enterprise," said Patricia A. Rivers, the Defense Department official who chaired the panel. The report suggested that contractors could save on overhead and other costs by being permitted to buy a group of ships, not just one at a time.

Among the changes recommended by the panel: better screening of contractors to weed out those with questionable records; more inspections by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; and more direction to contractors about safety and environmental laws.

The panel said the Navy should carry out a pilot project to gather information to improve the scrapping process.

E. Grey Lewis, a former Navy general counsel, said the recommendations don't go far enough

"They still haven't stepped up to the plate," said Lewis. "The theme I detected from this report is that the government will rely on

increased and better oversight. They still want to contract out all the responsibility and liability to the scrapper."

Rep. George Miller, a California Democrat, sounded a similar theme. "It may be that there are costs associated with the safe scrapping of old ships just as there are with the safe closure of military bases," he said.

The most controversial portion of the panel's report dealt with the possibility of selling obsolete government ships for scrapping abroad. Most shipbreaking overseas is done under wretched conditions on beachfront plots in India, Pakistan and Bangladesh.

The panel acknowledged that sending U.S. ships for scrapping overseas is viewed as exporting safety and environmental problems to the Third World. But the panel said that issue should be balanced against the economic realities of developing nations.

"The panel felt it was important not to foreclose the overseas option while aggressively pursuing the domestic option," said Rivers. The panel's report added: "The goal of U.S. policy should be to promote improvements in ship-scrapping practices in those countries, particularly with respect to protection of workers and the environment."

Mikulski said that argument was not persuasive. "The panel is unrealistic in presuming that we can change the way overseas ship scrappers do business," she said.

The Navy and Maritime Administration had suspended the export plan while the panel was reviewing the issue. Those suspensions will remain in effect at least until the Navy and Maritime Administration discuss the export plan with the EPA and other agencies, officials said yesterday.

The panel included representatives from the Navy, Maritime Administration, State, Justice, Labor and Transportation departments, as well as the Environmental Protection Agency. The panel, or a similar group, will reconvene in a year to evaluate the scrapping program.

Washington Post April 21, 1998 Pg. 10

Marine Pilot Says Charges Are Motivated By Politics

Proceedings Set For Alps Tragedy

Reuters

CAMP LEJEUNE, N.C., April 20—The pilot of a Marine Corps jet involved in a fatal mishap over an Italian ski resort regrets the accident but believes charges in the case are politically motivated, his attorney said today.

Capt. Richard J. Ashby and his three crew members face negligent homicide and involuntary manslaughter charges after their EA-6B Prowler severed two ski lift cables during a low-altitude flight over the Italian Alps, killing 20 skiers in a gondola car that was sent plunging to the ground.

"For decades, military members have been involved in training exercises which have resulted in deaths, and in many of those cases there have been acts of negligence and perhaps even recklessness. And yet, there does not appear to be anyone court-martialed previously in similar circumstances," civilian attorney Frank Spinner said.

A military judge scheduled an Article 32 proceeding, the equivalent of a civilian grand jury, to begin June 15 to determine whether Ashby, 30, of Mission Viejo, Calif. and his navigator, Capt. Joseph Schweitzer, 30, of Westbury, N.Y., will face court-martial for their roles in the mishap.

The judge, Lt. Col. Ronald Rodgers, scheduled a separate Article 32 proceeding on May 5 for the two crewmen -- Capt. Chandler P. Seagraves, 28, of Ninevah, Ind., and Capt. William L. Rainey II, 26, of Englewood, Colo. They were in the jet's rear seats operating electronic equipment during the fatal flight.

The EA-6B Prowler electronic surveillance jet was allegedly flying too low and too fast when it severed two gondola cables at a ski resort near Cavalese, Italy, on Feb. 3.

"It goes without saying that each of the crew members have experienced a great deal of regret about what happened. Their hearts go out in sympathy to the families of those who perished in this accident," Spinner said.

Washington Times April 21, 1998 Pg. 3

Teen hackers create scare at Pentagon of electronic war

By Bill Gertz
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Senior Pentagon officials were so concerned about recent sophisticated attacks against U.S. defense computers that they notified the White House an Iraqi electronic attack might be under way.

The culprits proved instead to be three teen-agers, two in California and an Israeli.

"This was real," said a government security official. "There was a series of systematic attacks against defense information infrastructure hosts" — the unclassified computer networks that are one of three vital Pentagon communication tools used for everything from sending ships to sea to ordering spare parts.

The attacks coincided with U.S. military preparations in early February for large-scale air and missile strikes on Iraq for its refusal to permit United Nations weapons inspections.

At about the same time, the Pentagon came under an intense three-week electronic bombardment. Only weeks later was it learned the attacks were probably the work of international hackers.

Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre, who was continually briefed on the attacks, was so concerned at one point about the prospect of a crippling strategic computer attack that he went to the White House to brief President Clinton.

A second Pentagon official said that while the activity was judged unlikely to be a government-backed computer attack, "because of the context in which it was happening, we could not rule out that this was an Iraqi effort." Mr. Clinton was briefed because "he has taken a keen interest in infrastructure vulnerabilities."

At least 11 Pentagon computer network sites were hit and others probably were victimized, said officials close to the issue.

Mr. Hamre called the cyber attacks "the most organized and systematic attack the Pentagon has. seen to date."

The attackers exploited a weakness in the Solaris operating system used in many Pentagon computer networks that allowed the

unknown intruders to break in, plant a cyber "trap door," and close it up — all without leaving a trace for system operators to find, the security official said.

What alarmed top Pentagon officials was that several of the attacks passed through the United Arab Emirates, while others were traced to Germany and Israel.

"There was the possibility that started to pop in people's minds: Hey, this could be the Iraqis prepping us for an information-warfare attack," the official said.

The Pentagon traced the attackers around the world several times but could not find the source. The official said the timing of the attacks prompted "a very large amount of concern at the high levels of the Department of Defense."

The matter is still part of an ongoing investigation by the FBI.

Weeks later, the FBI traced the attacks to two high school students in Cloverdale, Calif. And on March 18, authorities in Israel arrested an 18-year-old hacker dubbed "the Analyzer" and charged him with breaking into Pentagon computers.

The threat of potentially crippling electronic attacks prompted the U.S. Strategic Command at Offutt Air Force Base, Neb., to set up a new alert system similar to the Defcon — defense condition — levels used to prepare U.S. forces for nuclear war.

The Infocon alerts range from Normal to Alpha, Bravo, Charlie, Delta — the highest alert state. At each level, various security steps are taken to minimize possible attacks, such as disconnecting from the Internet and monitoring networks full time.

• *Jerry Seper contributed to this report.*

New York Times April 21, 1998 Pg. 1

NATO Opponents Vocal, Diverse and Active

By Eric Schmitt

WASHINGTON -- Ben & Jerry's is against expanding NATO. So is Phyllis Schlafly, the arch-conservative activist. So is Sam Nunn, the retired Georgia Democrat who was the Senate's most authoritative voice on national security matters.

From left, right and center -- and all points in between on the political compass -- an unlikely coalition of arms control advocates, business leaders, United Nations-bashers and foreign-policy experts have launched a grass-roots campaign to derail the addition of Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic to the military alliance.

A business group headed by Ben Cohen, the chairman of Ben & Jerry's, aired a 30-second commercial on several network talk shows on Sunday warning that NATO expansion would alienate Russia and rekindle cold war tensions. The same group took out a full-page ad in The New York Times Monday with the headline, "Hey, Let's Scare the Russians!"

The right-to-left coalition has set up "electronic town meetings" on talk-radio shows in more than 20 cities, including broadcasts in Raleigh, N.C., Monday and in Concord, N.H., on Tuesday.

Opponents of NATO expansion know they face an uphill struggle trying to reverse the tide of support for NATO expansion in the Senate, which is expected to resume debate on the issue later this week. Two-thirds of the Senate -- 67 of 100 senators -- must approve the expansion.

"We need 34 converts, and that's a long way to go," said Sen. Robert Smith, a New Hampshire Republican who has championed the fight against NATO expansion.

Indeed, administration officials say they are confident they have the votes now to win, but acknowledge there is always some tightening up as a final floor vote approaches, and Senators hone in on the issue.

"There's been no softening, in fact we've been strengthening the vote," said one senior government official who said administration aides "worked hard" over the two-week congressional recess to coax and cajole fence-sitters.

But the loose coalition seems to have picked up steam after the NATO debate and final vote was postponed until after the recess by Sen. Trent Lott of Mississippi, the majority leader, who supports enlarging the alliance.

Groups as different as the libertarian Cato Institute and the liberal Council for a Liveable World had waging individual campaigns against NATO expansion for nearly a year and recently sought strength in numbers with a coordinated effort.

"There was a convergence of concern," said Mark Sommer, director of the Mainstream Media Project, an educational organization in Arcata, Calif., that helped produce the hour-long radio call-in programs.

"The town meetings are a vehicle for shaming the Senate to perform one of its highest constitutional obligations, and to revive a democratic culture that doesn't talk about issues like these at the dinner table anymore," said Sommer.

Liberals and many business leaders, including Cohen, voice concern about the costs of NATO expansion -- of up to $125 billion over 10 years, depending on various assumptions -- and about antagonizing Russia.

"Ben's belief is that NATO's expansion will soak up billions of taxpayers dollars that could be better spent on our domestic agenda, such as education," said Gary Ferdman, executive director of Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities, an educational and lobbying organization that raised $150,000 for the television and newspaper ads. Cohen is president of the organization.

The newspaper ad warns, "Let's take NATO and expand it toward Russia's very borders. We'll assure the Russians we come in peace." The ad continues, "It's the same feeling of peace and security Americans would have if Russia were in a military alliance with Canada and Mexico, armed to the teeth, and excluding the United States. We'd all sleep better then, right?"

Many conservatives in the coalition fear that expanding NATO will dilute the military alliance and subject the United States to myriad new military commitments.

"It would obligate us to go war to defend the borders in Eastern Europe," said Mrs. Schlafly, who founded the 80,000-member Eagle Forum. "We don't think that's an American responsibility. We see this as one Bosnia after another."

Washington Post April 21, 1998 Pg. 10

Napalm Returns to California

CHINA LAKE NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER, Calif.—The orphaned shipment of napalm is back in California.

The 12,000 gallons of the flammable gel, a relic of the Vietnam War, arrived at this military installation Sunday, said Navy civilian spokeswoman Jeannie Light at the Naval Facilities Engineering Command in San Diego.

The napalm left another California base, the Fallbrook Naval Weapons Facility, on April 11 on what was intended to be a one-way trip to an industrial recycling plant in East Chicago, Ind. But the recycler backed out of the deal, citing political protests.

China Lake, in the Mojave Desert northwest of Los Angeles, was chosen for its high security, proximity to a railroad and expertise in handling hazardous waste. The two 6,000-gallon containers could remain as long as three months until another company is found to recycle the napalm.

Navy officials have previously said that the viscous mixture of polystyrene, gasoline and benzene is far less volatile than gasoline alone and that sending napalm by rail is safe—far safer than transporting other fuels.

Washington Post April 21, 1998 Pg. 21

No-Account Government

By James K. Glassman

Imagine that a top accounting firm performs its annual audit of a giant corporation. It finds the books in such a horrific state that it is forced to write in its official transmittal letter: "We are unable to, and we do not, express an opinion on the accompanying financial statements."

No opinion! Consequences would be swift and dire. The stock of the giant corporation would plummet (as Cendant Corp.'s did last week), its bond rating would fall, the SEC would investigate, the CEO might be forced out, stockholders would bombard management with lawsuits and the story would be smeared all over the newspapers.

Now imagine that it's not a giant corporation being audited but the federal government. Consequences? Next to zero.

Last year, for the first time in history, the federal government prepared consolidated financial statements that were subjected to an independent audit by the General Accounting Office (GAO). The results were an unmitigated disaster.

In a letter to Congress on March 31, James F. Hinchman, who, as acting comptroller general, heads the GAO, wrote, "In summary, significant financial systems weaknesses, problems with fundamental recordkeeping, incomplete documentation, and weak internal controls, including computer controls, prevent the government from accurately reporting a large portion of its assets, liabilities, and costs."

Hinchman said that the government could not account for "billions of dollars of property, equipment and supplies." It couldn't "accurately report major portions of the net costs of government operations." It couldn't even calculate the loans that were payable to it or the loans it had guaranteed.

In other words, taxpayers send $1.6 trillion a year to Washington, but the people entrusted with this money don't know what happens to much of it. A kind of Hippocratic Oath for any government should be: First, account for the people's money. But our government isn't doing that. And where was the press? Oh, covering the latest non-events in the Lewinsky scandal.

The GAO revealed some of the worst abuses last Thursday at a House subcommittee hearing that focused on the Pentagon. Only the conscientious chairman, Rep. Steve Horn (R-Calif.), and freshman Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio) attended. Kucinich found it "mind-boggling."

"Forget about $600 toilet seat covers," wrote James Warren, one of the few to report the hearings, in his column in Sunday's Chicago Tribune. The GAO findings "dwarf previous claims of federal ineptitude or stupidity."

Eleanor Hill, the Pentagon's inspector general, told the panel that "financial statement data for most DOD funds remains unreliable and essentially not in condition for audit." One problem, said Hill, is that there are 122 separate accounting systems (!) in the department.

And, she added, they "cannot produce an audit trail of information." What this means in plain English is that, unlike virtually every American business and non-profit organization, the Pentagon does not operate with such rudiments as double-entry bookkeeping.

The results? Well, for one thing, there were more than $10 billion in "problem disbursements" -- that is, payments that can't be matched against contracts. Also chilling is that the Pentagon doesn't know the whereabouts of much of its $636 billion in property, plant and equipment -- including such items as missile launchers and F-18 jet engines.

Kucinich asked if any of the missing military equipment was classified and if the CIA had been involved in figuring out where it ended up. "The answer," said another GAO official, "would be yes."

Said Kucinich in a later interview with Warren, "Weapons systems are missing, and questions about national security and foreign policy are raised. Consider the illegal transfer of arms in Iran-contra. Then look here: You don't even need to go through the steps Oliver North went through. All you need is to lose some paperwork. Weapons may be falling into the hands of foreign entities. It may dwarf Iran-contra."

It may, but even if it doesn't, the government that Vice President Al Gore is supposed to be reinventing has turned into the Gang That Couldn't Keep Its Books Straight. This is no joke, though.

Horn found these results of the audit particularly "appalling": HUD is making $900 million a year in overpayments on rent subsidies, and the Health Care Financing Administration is making $23 billion in overpayments on Medicare.

In order to get the federal books to balance, the GAO had to plug in $12 billion in "unreconciled transactions." And that's a net figure. In fact, there were more than $100 billion worth of such dealings -- in positive and negative amounts. Try this technique if you're Ford or General Electric and investors will take your stock down 20 percent or so.

Anyone who runs a business knows that the first rule is to keep honest, clean and complete records. To do less is unethical, and often criminal. Gore, Treasury Secretary Bob Rubin and budget chief Franklin Raines owe that much to America's citizens.

The writer is a fellow at the American Enterprise Institute.

New York Times April 21, 1998

Taming the Biological Beast

By Richard Preston

For decades, the conventional view among American scientists was that biological weapons aren't much of a problem. Meanwhile, powerful bioweapons were developed and deployed by the Soviet Union and probably by other countries, and the knowledge of how to make them has spread. Smallpox virus can be made in glass jars the size of wine bottles and released into the air with a humidifier. One F.B.I. scientist said to me: "We're seeing a lot of hoaxes, and incompetent people trying to make biological weapons. The incidents are happening at a rate of roughly one a month. My feeling is that sooner or later someone is going to get it right."

Having failed to identify the problem or come to grips with it intellectually or technically, the scientific community and the Government now owe the public a makeup effort. It could start with a few simple measures that would make us safer and less vulnerable.

As experts with whom I've been talking see it, the first step needs to be the involvement of public health doctors in emergency planning. Yet the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention remains largely uninvolved, disconnected from the planning loop and inadequately financed for the task. State and local public health surveillance needs to be strengthened. That would have an immediate payoff, since it would help control new and emerging "natural" diseases that are now taking lives in this country. And if a bioterror attack is recognized early, many lives can be saved.

Consider what might actually happen if a pound or two of dried anthrax were released into the air of New York City. Many thousands of people might be exposed, but only a small fraction of them would get sick and die. It would happen over time -- time enough to save many people if some basic preparations have been made.

Anthrax incubates silently in the body for three days to several weeks after exposure. Then the first symptoms appear. Virtually no doctor in the United States has seen a case of anthrax or knows how to diagnose it. The symptoms of anthrax resemble flu or a cold; then the victim dies of what looks like pneumonia. Many days might pass before it would finally become apparent that New York had been hit with

anthrax. But where? And how much anthrax went into the air? The F.B.I. would come under excruciating pressure to find the perpetrator, who would be long gone, and the trail might have gone cold.

Everyone in the city would wonder if he had been exposed and whether another attack might occur. There would be an overwhelming demand for antibiotics, which can cure anthrax provided they are taken before symptoms appear. Antibiotics would disappear from the shelves instantly, and the demand would create a national shortage.

There is a good vaccine for anthrax. It can work even if it's given to a person who has already been exposed. The Government would need to fly in many tons of antibiotics and vaccine. But there's no stockpile of antibiotics or anthrax vaccine. Such a stockpile could stop the dying quickly and reduce fear. It might also discourage a terrorist from using anthrax.

A Web site should be set up that any public-health or primary-care doctor could look at, offering basic information and training modules in anthrax and smallpox. (Wannabe terrorists are already using the Internet to spread information about bioweapons; they're ahead of the public-health doctors.) A medical training module would cost around $200,000 to set up: peanuts. Yet it could make a big difference. Early detection of a bioterror event not only would save lives, it also would enable law enforcement people to get on the trail of a terrorist faster.

Anthrax isn't contagious and doesn't spread. Smallpox spreads like chain lightning, and since the entire human species now lacks immunity to smallpox (the shot wears off), it is the planet's most dangerous potential biological weapon. If smallpox were released anywhere in this country, experts believe that at least 20 million to 30 million people would need to be vaccinated quickly to stop the surging outbreak. Right now, there are only about seven million usable doses of vaccine on hand.

There is a new way to make smallpox vaccine that is fast and cheap. But it needs approval from the Food and Drug Administration, and manufacturing capability must be set up. Enough vaccine to protect the entire American population could be stored in a building smaller than a garage, and the vaccine would last for decades before it had to be replaced with fresh stocks. That would pretty much remove smallpox from the arsenal of a terrorist. It would also take smallpox away from Saddam Hussein far more effectively (and cheaply) than bombing his laboratories.

One other step is needed. The community of biologists in the United States has maintained a kind of hand-wringing silence on the ethics of creating bioweapons -- a reluctance to talk about it with the public, even a disbelief that it's happening. Biological weapons are a disgrace to biology. The time has come for top biologists to assert their leadership and speak out, to take responsibility on behalf of their profession for the existence of these weapons and the means of protecting the population against them, just as leading physicists did a generation ago when nuclear weapons came along. Moral pressure costs nothing and can help; silence is unacceptable now.

Richard Preston is the author of "The Hot Zone" and "The Cobra Event."

Washington Times April 21, 1998 Pg. 16

Imagine, Iraq failing to comply

Our problems with Iraq were supposed to be over. First, late last year, President Clinton declared victory after Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov did our negotiating for us and got Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein to "allow" United Nations weapons inspectors to do their job. Then, in February, United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan was our savior when he got Saddam to agree to let the inspectors go back to work in the "presidential sites" Saddam had previously — and illegally, it should be remembered — refused to allow access to. Now, however, we have an official report from the horse's mouth: the weapons inspectors, who tell a very different story. Basically, it's that all is not well in the land of Iraqi disarmament.

The essence of Richard Butler's biannual report is that Iraq has succeeded in making the inspectors' job impossible, and therefore not enough progress has been made in terms of verifying whether Iraq has disarmed. Mr. Butler, chief of the weapons inspection team, says that in fact if Saddam Hussein intended to hinder the inspectors' work by essentially creating the "crises" over the past few months, he was successful. "A major consequence of the four-month crisis authored by Iraq has been that, in contrast with the prior reporting period, virtually no progress in verifying disarmament has been able to be reported." Mr. Butler was just as blunt about the Iraqi attitude toward weapons inspections: "Iraq's heightened policy of disarmament by declaration, no matter how vigorously pursued or stridently voiced, cannot remove the need for verification as the key means through which the credibility of its claim can be established."

Mr. Butler could not be more correct, if for no other reason than that the requirements for the lifting of sanctions against Iraq are based primarily on the question of disarmament. After the Gulf War, an embargo was imposed on the Iraqi regime and a weapons inspection system designed to prevent Saddam from being a further threat to his neighbors. But through delay tactics, belligerence and unfair attacks on the weapons inspectors themselves, Saddam has managed not only to avoid disarming, but to turn much of international opinion in the direction of lifting the embargo. Now he is demanding that he be authorized by the U.N. Security Council to spend $300 million on repairs to his dilapidated oil industry, supposedly to sell more oil for food. The fact that he has been selling oil in contravention of U.N. resolutions, pocketing millions of dollars without an ounce of concern for his starving nation, is conveniently ignored.

Iraq, for its part, is at least honest about its intentions. A statement from the government carried by the Iraqi News Agency declared, "The time has come for lifting the embargo completely and comprehensively." The statement went on to threaten those who still support sanctions: "Only they, if they oppose the lifting of the sanctions, will bear in addition to the burden of previous crises, the burden of new crises and what harm may hit our people."

It's time for the White House to be equally unequivocal on our Iraq policy. The Clinton administration has pawned off this problem on the Russians and the U.N. and the results have been unacceptable. Obviously, it would be nice to operate within an international consensus; but support for maintaining sanctions is waning among our allies while Iraq continues to renege on its promises. It's time for the U.S. to take the lead in getting Saddam to abide by his U.N. commitments.

Washington Times April 21, 1998 Pg. 15

FRANK GAFFNEY JR.

Handwriting on the Iraqi wall

"Curiouser and curiouser." That's how Alice described the ever-more-bizarre situations she found herself in while visiting Lewis Carroll's Wonderland. The same could be said of the increasingly surreal drama involving Saddam Hussein and U.S. responses to his malevolence.

To be sure, the central character of this drama could hardly be more apparent. In fact, the handwriting is on the wall for those willing to see it: Saddam is not going to get rid of his weapons of mass destruction. Period. As long as his regime remains a going concern, so will Iraq's covert nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programs and its effort to build long-range ballistic missiles with which to deliver them.

This is the unmistakable import of the six-month update supplied last week by U.N. Special Commission (UNSCOM) Chairman Richard Butler. As the New York Times put it on April 17, Mr. Butler reported to the Security Council that "Iraq is no closer to meeting the requirements for the lifting of sanctions than it was last fall, when Baghdad began to disrupt efforts to locate and destroy its remaining weapons of mass destruction."

This sorry state of affairs is, as the communists loved to say, "no accident, comrade." Consider the characterization offered by Mr. Butler's deputy, Charles Duelfer, of the condition in which U.N. inspectors found the Iraq's "presidential sites" — those facilities Saddam declared critical to Iraqi "national security, sovereignty and dignity" and that he assented to open to U.N. inspection only after Secretary General Kofi Annan reenacted Neville Chamberlain's notorious self-abasement and appeasement of Hitler at Munich:

"It was clearly apparent that all sites had undergone extensive evacuation. In all the sites outside of Baghdad, for example, there were no documents and no computers. The buildings were largely empty."

In other words, Saddam's regime made a mockery of these inspections. It then added insult to injury by subjecting the inspectors (pursuant to the Annan-brokered deal) to interference from accompanying diplomats, thereby compounding the obstructionism routinely practiced by the U.N. teams' legions of Iraqi escorts.

To put it bluntly, the secretary general — and all those who indulged in the delusion that his intervention would do more than postpone the day of reckoning — have been had. Saddam has proven yet again to be anything but the sort of man with whom, as Mr. Annan blithely put it in February, we "can do business."

In fact, Mr. Butler said as much in his latest report, albeit cloaked in the understated parlance of diplomacy: "A major consequence of the four-month crisis authored by Iraq has been that virtually no progress in verifying disarmament has been able to be reported. If that is what Iraq intended by the crisis, then, in large measure, it could be said to have been successful."

This is where things start getting curiouser. At the same time that UNSCOM is reporting that Iraqi concealment, deception and related activities are preventing it from declaring Saddam's regime to be compliant with its obligation to eliminate chemical and biological weapons and longer-range missiles, another U.N. agency is giving Iraq a clean bill of health.

According to Sunday's New York Times, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) declared two weeks ago that "Iraq had successfully compiled a 'full, final and complete' account of its past nuclear weapons programs. It also said that 'the agency's ongoing monitoring and verification activities carried out since October 1997 have not revealed indications of the existence in Iraq of prohibited equipment or materials or of the conduct of prohibited activity.'"

It perhaps should come as no surprise that an international organization that was completely duped about Saddam Hussein's nuclear weapons program before Operation Desert Storm is now persuaded that no news is good news. (Former U.N. inspector David Kay recalls how a key Iraqi physicist delighted in revealing that he learned everything he needed to know about misleading the IAEA while serving as one of its inspectors.) No one else should be under any illusions, however. The Iraqi despot remains just as determined to realize his nuclear ambitions as he is to preserve his other programs for weapons of mass destruction.

Curiously, this reality is evident even to some who tend to place great faith in international regimes and organizations to control the proliferation of such weapons. For example, the Times cited expressions of concern about the IAEA's conclusion by such paragons of arms control orthodoxy as the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, the Henry L. Stimson Center and the Nuclear Control Institute. To their credit, these organizations now appear seized with the conviction that a closed, totalitarian nation like Iraq that has enjoyed access to relevant know-how and technology can never safely be considered a truly nuclear-free zone.

Obviously, the only hope of actually removing the danger posed by Saddam's nuclear and other programs is to remove Saddam and his clique from power. Neither the perpetuation of international sanctions nor an indefinite continuation of the most intrusive imaginable inspection regime — to say nothing of U.N. agencies granting Saddam's Iraq unwarranted "Good Housekeeping Seals of Approval" and the easing of sanctions they will inevitably induce — will do the trick.

It is curious, yea bizarre, that the Clinton administration refuses to grasp this reality. Still curiouser, though, is the fact that neither the administration nor the editorial boards of the New York Times and The Washington Post (which have within recent days warned of the danger posed by Saddam's abiding capabilities) nor the arms controllers comprehend another, related point:

It is vastly easier for a determined adversary like Saddam to conceal chemical and biological weapons programs than it is a nuclear one. If the present, relatively comprehensive on-site inspections can't catch Iraqi cheating, there is no chance that covert weapons programs elsewhere will be found out by the inspections and other monitoring called for in the Chemical Weapons Convention — and those now being sought to "put teeth" in the wholly unverifiable 1972 Biological Weapons Convention.

To the contrary, these well-intentioned measures are doomed to prove counterproductive as they encourage American policy-makers and others to misread the pro-

liferation handwriting on the wall — and to eschew the sorts of steps at home and abroad necessary to reduce the danger it portends.

Frank J. Gaffney Jr. is the director of the Center for Security Policy and a columnist for The Washington Times.

Defense News April 20-26, 1998 Pg. 2

Pentagon Official Vows To Keep MEADS On Track

John Hamre, U.S. deputy defense secretary, has decided to uphold the development schedule for the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS), despite internal Pentagon efforts to kill or delay the program, a Ballistic Missile Defense Organization spokesman said April 17.

The antimissile system, a NATO program shared with Germany and Italy, has suffered repeated attacks by DoD budget cutters.

Washington Post April 21, 1998 Pg. 21

Scare Talk About Muslims in Europe

By Arslan Malik

"It's a mistake if somebody thinks that it is possible to establish an Islamic state in Bosnia; after all, it's multi-ethnic and multi-cultural." The man voicing these sentiments was Mohammad Ebrahim Taherian, ambassador to Bosnia of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

His recent remarks to me were apparently directed toward Western critics, including some members of the U.S. Congress, who maintain that there is growing Islamic extremism in Bosnia. They trace the roots of this extremism primarily to the early years of the war in the Balkans, when Iranian officials authorized arms shipments to the Bosniaks (Bosnian Muslims). While there is no evidence that the Bosniaks accepted guns from Iran with ideological strings attached, critics point to several indications of growing Islamic extremism in Bosnia, including the politics of the Bosniak leadership, the secret arming of the Bosniaks and the continued presence of Islamic fighters from other countries. The concerns these factors raise are, I believe, unwarranted.

Those who fear a radical Islamization of Bosnia often point to the politics of Alija Izetbegovic, the Bosniak chairman of the three-member Bosnian presidency, and his ruling nationalist Muslim party, the Party of Democratic Action (SDA). Izetbegovic, who authored the 1960s treatise "Islamic Declaration" and was imprisoned in the 1980s for his religious beliefs, is viewed by some as having an Islamist "agenda." In reality, Izetbegovic and his supporters are themselves wary of extremism.

From the outset of the Balkan debacle, Bosniak leaders have advocated a multi-ethnic society -- much more so than their Bosnian Serb and Bosnian Croat counterparts -- realizing that any other position on their part would tear apart the country in which Bosniaks are a majority. Besides, if politics in other parts of the country indicate the future of nationalist parties all across Bosnia, the SDA may soon begin to lose its grip on the Bosniak political arena.

Earlier this year in the Republika Srpska (the Bosnian Serb entity in Bosnia), Milorad Dodik, a member of a moderate opposition party called the Independent Social Democrats, was elected prime minister. This appears to be a pivotal step in diminishing the power of the nationalist Serbian Democratic Party (SDS), which until recently had dominated Bosnian Serb politics.

In fact, the tide may already have turned against Izetbegovic's party. In order to encourage political pluralism, Carlos Westendorp, the international community's high representative to Bosnia, recently promised to support the social democratic parties that oppose the SDA.

Also of concern in recent months are reports that the Bosniaks are receiving secret military aid from various Muslim countries such as Malaysia and Iran, in contravention of the Dayton agreement. Commentators argue that such a Bosniak arms buildup suggests the Bosniaks are preparing for an offensive against the Bosnian Serbs. However, the $400 million U.S. sponsored "Train and Equip" program for the Bosniaks and the Bosnian Croats that has been underway since July 1996 -- which is arming the Bosniaks with state-of-the-art weaponry -- would appear to render any secret arming of the Bosniaks superfluous. Furthermore, the U.S. State Department is currently considering a similar program for the Bosnian Serbs to help level the playing field.

The current presence in Bosnia of SFOR (the NATO-led Stabilization Force) also discourages any reckless behavior by the Bosniaks. And a follow-on NATO force is already scheduled to replace the present one when its mandate expires this summer.

Discussion of Islamic extremism in Bosnia has also revolved around the presence of the mujahideen, Islamic freedom fighters who are veterans of the Afghan war. Some 2,000 of them came to Bosnia at a time when Western leaders saw the conflict there as a civil war that did not merit outside intervention. Since the war, however, most have left the country; only about 350 remain.

Most traditional Bosniaks, as well as progressive ones, find the puritanical lifestyles and habits of the mujahideen intolerable. The Bosnian weekly news magazine Dani recently described numerous instances of what might be called Bosniak "flight" -- cases of locals from traditional villages leaving their homes when mujahideen came and settled nearby. Ejup Ganic, president of the Bosniak-Bosnian Croat Federation and a former University of Illinois professor, told me, "We did not give the mujahideen entrance visas because we did not control our borders. They came from Croatia and Serbia. They were brought in and whoever brought them in should help them go back." Although there is no substantiated evidence of Ganic's theory, the mujahideen remain a minor symptom of the war, unlikely to find a following or to become an institution in Bosnia.

The Bosniaks are European Muslims, not Islamic extremists, a distinction to which Western policymakers should be sensitive. Ironically, a Western policy predicated on distrust of the Bosniaks would alienate them, cause them to despair and perhaps push them closer to the adversarial role feared by skeptical Western observers in the first place.

The United States' pivotal role in ending the war and the primarily Western initiative in preserving the peace and rebuilding Bosnia are steps in the right direction toward cooperation instead, and toward carrying a much needed message to the Muslim world.

Arslan Malik is a writer who lives in Charlottesville, Va.

Washington Post
April 21, 1998
Pg. 21

The Catch-22 Law

By Benjamin Wittes

The government has some pretty strong evidence to back up its charges that Theresa Marie Squillacote and her husband, Kurt Alan Stand, conspired to spy against the United States. The files of the East German spy agency refer to them both as agents. And Squillacote turned over classified documents from her Pentagon job to undercover FBI agents she believed were South African operatives. What makes the case against this anachronistic pair of leftists interesting is not any chance that they may actually be innocent. The case is notable because of the government's use -- and possible misuse -- during its investigation of one of the

strangest federal laws currently on the books, a law whose use has risen dramatically in recent years.

The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) allows the government to spy on suspected foreign agents without getting a normal search or wiretap warrant. Typically, in order to conduct surveillance against Americans without violating their Fourth Amendment right to be free from unreasonable searches, the government must demonstrate before a court probable cause to believe the would-be targets committed a crime.

The standard under the FISA, however, is considerably lower, and the procedure is very different. To get a FISA warrant to spy on a suspected spy, the feds go before a super-secret court located in a sealed room in the Department of Justice. With no defense lawyers present, they need only show probable cause that the target is an "agent of a foreign power" engaged in intelligence gathering against the United States. Since the FISA court was created in 1978, it has not turned down even one of the government's roughly 10,000 surveillance requests. The reason the FISA standard is constitutional is that the government is supposed to use FISA surveillance not for criminal investigations but for counterintelligence probes pursued under the president's authority to conduct foreign policy.

The catch is that in cases such as Stand's and Squillacotes's, which eventually end up as criminal matters, the law does allow the fruits of FISA searches and wiretaps to be introduced as evidence. And, critically, when the government uses FISA evidence in criminal cases, it is not required to disclose its original FISA application to the defense. So as Stand, Squillacote, and a third defendant named James Clark prepare to face trial for an alleged conspiracy to spy against this country, they cannot effectively attack -- as normal defendants can -- the basis of the search warrants obtained against them. This is true even though the government's case is largely based on evidence obtained during 550 days of FISA surveillance of them.

Despite this handicap, the defense has made a rather impressive case that Stand and Squillacote were not agents of a foreign power at the time the FISA surveillance began in 1996 -- and that the FISA warrants were, therefore, unlawful. The FISA is written in the present tense, requiring the government to show that the prospective target is currently a foreign agent. Yet by 1996, East Germany had long since ceased to exist, and the Soviet Union -- on whose behalf the Justice Department also claims the two conspired to spy -- was similarly defunct. While prosecutors have also alleged that Stand and Squillacote sought to spy for Russia, the arrest affidavit contains precious little evidence that the couple were ever Russian agents.

The most that the public evidence shows about Squillacote and Stand is that they kept in touch with their former East German handler -- a man named Lothar Ziemer -- and were hopeful that Ziemer could forge some sort of relationship with post-Soviet Russia so they could continue spying. But this is not probable cause that they were actually agents of the Russian Federation. By the time the FISA court authorized the surveillance against them in 1996, in fact, Ziemer had been arrested in Germany and publicly exposed as a Russian spy. For the FISA surveillance to be legitimate, the government must have something more on Stand and Squillacote than just the Ziemer link.

The defense is, therefore, asking Judge Claude M. Hilton to suppress all of the evidence obtained under FISA. Judge Hilton will get to review the original FISA application in secret and decide whether or not it passes muster. The defense, however, will not get to see it unless the judge decides it has problems.

This is the fundamental Catch-22 of the FISA. If the government's application really is inadequate and its investigation was based on unlawful surveillance, the defense must rely on a judge with access only to government arguments to discern the inadequacies. If, on the other hand, there is some still-secret evidence that justifies the warrants, the government is then necessarily withholding one of the factual premises of its investigation. Either way, the right of the accused to attack the evidence against them is impaired.

The writer is a member of the editorial page staff.

Wall Street Journal April 21, 1998

For Expansion: The Case Clinton Isn't Making

By Zalmay Khalilzad

This week the Senate will start debating the question of whether to allow the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. A vote on the issue is likely next week. Although the Clinton administration supports NATO expansion, it has not made its case forcefully enough. In its public defense of NATO expansion, the administration has emphasized bringing the three Central European states into the zone of democracy, peace and prosperity. This argument is a good start, but a much stronger case can be made. NATO expansion is vital not only for the well-being of these potential new members, but also for the security of the U.S. and its Western allies.

The first strategic argument for an expanded NATO is to hedge against uncertainties in Russia. The administration argues that NATO expansion is not directed against Russia. This is true, to a point. As long as Russia is not expansionist, it will have nothing to fear from an enlarged NATO. In fact, a democratic and nonimperial Russia should be NATO's partner. But Russia's future is not certain. Many in the Russian elite are unhappy with the current international system and the U.S.'s pre-eminence in it. They are nostalgic for their lost empire and would like to reimpose hegemony over the former Soviet territories and Eastern Europe.

Russia is too weak to dominate its former empire today. However, even with its current difficulties, Moscow is developing two new long-range nuclear missiles, is reluctant to ratify the Start II treaty, and insists on interpreting the Anti-ballistic Missile treaty in ways that put severe limits on effective defenses against ballistic missiles to which both the U.S. and Russia are increasingly vulnerable. Moscow's statements and behavior towards the Baltic states, Ukraine, the Caspian Basin and Central Asia at times have neoimperial overtones.

Russian weakness, however, will not last forever. Rich in natural and human resources, it will eventually re-emerge as a great power. A revitalized and democratic Russia would most likely seek greatness through economic prosperity and political stability. However, should a revitalized Russia prove hostile and expansionist, NATO membership for Eastern European states will act as a powerful deterrent against future Russian aggression in this region. Unfortunately, Russia can go either way--and which way it goes will not be affected by NATO expansion.

Second, an expanded NATO keeps Germany as part of an American-led international system. Eastern Europe is Germany's backyard, and the European Union is unable to look after the security of Western Europe by itself, let alone protect Eastern Europe. Therefore, if NATO does not stabilize Germany's frontiers, Germany might do so alone. Germany is a key democratic ally of the U.S. and prefers to cooperate within NATO to stabilize Eastern and Central Europe. A renationalization of German security policy will end NATO as we know it and could lead to a less stable, less unified Europe. This would create an enormous problem for U.S.

security interests, not only in Europe--both East and West--but around the world.

Third, an expanded NATO strengthens the U.S. position in Western Europe. The Eastern Europeans are more pro-American than most of our current allies. They attribute their freedom to the American-led containment of the Soviet Union, and they know that the U.S. led the alliance to expand NATO eastward. Within the alliance, they are likely to be strongly supportive of the dominant U.S. role. And should they also join the EU--as they are likely to--they will be a strong force for a continued U.S.-European alliance.

Fourth, an expanded NATO ties Europe and the U.S. closer together and opens the door for greater cooperation in other parts of the world, especially the Middle East. a region vital to both sides of the Atlantic.

NATO expansion eastward should be accompanied by an effort to develop a common U.S.-European strategy for ensuring energy security and for countering the spreading of weapons of mass destruction and missiles. And we need to consider steps to increase military cooperation between the U.S. and European nations for the longer term and agree to financial formulas for sharing the burden of Persian Gulf security as the Europeans develop their military capabilities. The Europeans have been freeloading at U.S. expense.

Thousands of the U.S. troops protect the gulf from Iran and Iraq. Europe contributes little, though it is more dependent on the region's oil and more vulnerable to its missiles. In exchange, the U.S. should be willing to give Europeans a greater say in decisions about the Middle East, including policies towards Iran. As with NATO expansion such steps are unlikely to be taken without U.S. leadership.

Although the administration may want to avoid publicly voicing these strategic reasons for NATO expansion in order to avoid offending Russia and some of our European allies, it is important that we recognize that NATO expansion is necessary to protect vital U.S. interests, increase cooperation among European and North American democracies and sustain American's global leadership. Given the stakes involved, congressional support should be overwhelming.

Mr. Khalilzad is the director of strategic studies at RAND. He was assistant undersecretary of defense for policy planning in the Bush administration. He is the author of "Extending the Western Alliance to East-Central Europe" (RAND, 1993).

Newsweek April 27, 1998 Pg. 24

Safety First

YOUR ARTICLE ABOUT THE PRODUCTION of the anthrax vaccine ("Anthrax Snafu," PERISCOPE, April 6) was, in our opinion, factually incorrect. Michigan Biologic Products Institute did not shut down as a result of the Food and Drug Administration inspection in November 1996, and no shutdown was ever directed or contemplated as a result of any FDA inspection. Production stopped in January of this year when the production contract expired. This was timed to accommodate the planned renovation of the vaccine production suite as part of the Department of Defense's acquisition strategy, established in consultation with MBPI. The renovations, expected to take one year, will ensure that MBPI remains in compliance with stringent federal manufacturing practices and will help meet the requirements of Secretary of Defense Cohen's immunization plan. Also, the FDA was not involved in DOD's decision to conduct additional testing on the anthrax stockpile—this was a self-directed DOD action. Finally, the renovation cost you cite—"at least $100 million"—is grossly exaggerated. The projected cost is actually about $20 million. Furthermore, the State of Michigan's decision to sell MBPI was made in December 1995 and preceded the November 1996 FDA inspection. The selling process is proceeding as a state acquisition process and currently involves multiple bidders. DOD, MBPI and the FDA have worked together to ensure quality products are provided to our forces and to ensure our military forces are safely protected from known biologic threats. None of us will accept anything less.

JOHN J. HAMRE
Deputy Secretary of Defense
United States Department of Defense
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Editor's note: NEWSWEEK *stands by its story.*

Editor's Note: The article referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, March 30, 1998, Pg. 25.

Legi-Slate April 17, 1998

SPECIAL REPORT

Pentagon Stops Bid Process On Navy's DD-21 Destroyer Fleet

By George C. Wilson
Legi-Slate News Service

WASHINGTON (April 17) -- The Pentagon has halted the Navy's $25 billion program to build a fleet of high tech destroyers for the 21st century because only one team of contractors offered to bid for the work, the Navy's shipbuilding chief revealed to LEGI-SLATE News Service.

John W. Douglass, the assistant secretary of the Navy in charge of developing and buying ships, said in the exclusive interview that the sticking point is not that two big shipbuilders, Bath Iron Works Corp. of Bath, Maine, and Ingalls Shipbuilding of Pascagoula, Miss., are teamed up together. But the Pentagon and Navy are concerned that they have enlisted just one firm to do the complex, high-tech work to transform their empty steel hulls into the DD-21, the most sophisticated destroyer ever built.

As a result, the Navy will not open its one and only DD-21 bid on May 22 as scheduled, Douglass said. He will instead convene the shipbuilders and other DD-21 participants in Washington within the next few days to figure out how to insert competition into the program, with a new round of bidding likely.

Some delay is inevitable, Douglas said, but the DD-21 program is in no danger of sinking at this point. "Come May or June, I see this coming out of the woods with a solution," he said in an interview that was interrupted by an apprehensive shipyard executive calling from an airplane to learn the status of the DD-21 program.

Companies that figure out how to stuff modern warships with an integrated system of computers, electronics, communications, radars, missiles and guns are called integrators. Bath and Ingalls have Lockheed Martin Corp.'s Government Electronic Systems division of Moorestown, N.J., on their team as the one and only integrator.

"The issue is getting the innovative power of two integration contractors, Douglass said. "We always planned to have two shipbuilders build this ship." The DD-21 is a highly automated, stealthy and lethal destroyer and received its designation because the Navy sees it as a revolutionary warship for controlling the seas in the 21st century. The plan is build 32 DD-21s for a total cost of about $25 billion, with construction of the first destroyer to begin in 2004.

"If you only have two shipyards and one integrator," Douglas said, "you don't get the benefit of where do you put the gun? What kind of combat system do you use? What kind of radar? How do you connect it up to the command, control and communications architecture that is evolving for the next century?"

If only one integrator is designing the complex systems, "You only get one guy's ideas" for doing the most important work of turning a steel hull into a weapon, Douglass said. "We think it's really important to get this competition of ideas. This new ship is the one that will carry us on into early in the

new century with all the sophisticated systems modern electronics can bring.

That's why the integration part of it is so important."

The Navy had hoped Raytheon Systems Co. of Arlington, Va., would compete with Lockheed as integrator for the DD-21. But neither Raytheon nor any other integrator intends to compete for the initial design phase of the DD-21 competition.

Navy officials said Raytheon executives have been complaining that they were frozen out by Bath and Ingalls and could not find another competitive shipbuilder to team up with. Raytheon apparently wants the Pentagon to force the Bath, Ingalls, Lockheed "dream team" to take Raytheon aboard, according to an official involved with the behind-the-scenes struggles.

But if the lone bid were accepted, Bath, Ingalls and Lockheed would be in a monopoly position at the very time the Clinton administration is fighting to prevent the merger of Lockheed Martin with Northrop Grumman Corp. Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and Under Secretary Jacques S. Gansler, his top procurement executive, contend the merger would lessen competition within the defense industry and raise the prices on weapons.

Because Cohen's predecessor, William J. Perry, encouraged mergers within the military-industrial complex, the Pentagon's sudden opposition to this latest marriage shocked many in the defense industry.

One theory being tossed around the Pentagon and the industry is that Raytheon pulled out of the DD-21 competition to confront the Clinton administration with a monopoly in shipbuilding that Raytheon figured the Pentagon would have to oppose. And, while having to oppose the DD-21 bidding as non- competitive, the theory goes, the administration would feel compelled to dig in on its opposition to the Lockheed Martin-Northrop Grumman merger for consistency's sake. Raytheon is concerned that the merger would hurt its business.

Under this scenario, Raytheon could get a fresh chance to compete in a new round of bidding on the DD-21 while also reinforcing its position against the mega-merger.

David J. Shea, a Raytheon spokesman, said his company was "eager to participate" in the DD-21 program. He declined to comment on theories of why Raytheon does not plan to submit a bid in this first round.

Douglass said he was not in the loop when his Pentagon bosses decided to ask the Justice Department to oppose the Lockheed Martin-Northrop Grumman merger. "It isn't affecting me at all," Douglass said. "It was a decision taken at the OSD [Office of the Secretary of Defense] level in conjunction with the Justice Department. The services don't play in that arena very much While this could be an issue in Jacques' [Gansler's] mind or [Deputy Secretary of Defense] John Hamre's mind or somebody else's mind, it has not been an issue for me."

Douglass said he met with Gansler in the past few days to discuss how to put competition into the DD-21 program without delaying the project for a long time. "Gansler asked for a week or two of hiatus," Douglass said. "We need a couple of weeks to hold some kind of discussion with everybody."

In meetings with shipbuilding executives the week of April 20, Douglass said the following options will be explored:

-- "Simply say to Bath and Ingalls, 'You can't be on the same team.' So that means one of them has to go to Lockheed and the other one has to go to Raytheon" to do the integration. "I don't favor this, but others do. I think the government should avoid, if it can, getting that far into who teams with whom."

-- "We could just have an integrators' competition. Then, after we pick the integrator, go tell them to go out and hold a competition for shipbuilder.

It's pretty awkward. It would be a little bit like instead of going to Boeing and Lockheed [aircraft companies] to build the Joint Strike Fighter, you go to Raytheon and Westinghouse and say, 'you guys build radars. You're going to be in charge of the next fighter airplane because radars are so important.' It kind of goes against the grain. I prefer the shipbuilders to be the prime contractors and not these integrators."

--Conduct two separate competitions, one among shipbuilders and the other among integrators. The shipbuilders would draw "preliminary designs" and the Navy would then tell the integrators they had to bid an all of the designs or none of them. "This third approach would be a way to make sure that all of the shipbuilders and all of the integrators could play," Douglass said. "It would be a fairly complicated thing, but it could be done."

Asked what his own preference was, Douglass replied: "I don't really have a recommendation until I've bounced these ideas off the shipbuilders and the integrators. Suppose they came in and said, 'We've worked it out so we're going to compete the combat system, instead of going sole source to Lockheed as our team member. Maybe that would satisfy people. I will have a recommendation to Jacques [Gansler], probably by next week."

With all parts of the Navy scrambling for dollars, Douglass acknowledged that any substantial delay in the DD-21 runs the risk of its account being raided.

"I don't think the whole program will slip a lot. There is a sense among ship- builders that we've got to get on with this."

Douglass said he feels a sense of mission about keeping shipyards healthy in this era when a U.S. naval presence in far-flung trouble spots is becoming increasingly important.

Sinking the DD-21 program "would be devastating to Ingalls and Bath," Douglass said. The program, which is scheduled to continue through the first 20 years of the next century, is crucial to the future of those shipyards. "Because it's so important to my shipyards, they need to be the crew chiefs on this," Douglass said.

Both shipyards have impeccable political credentials that have given them a receptive audience on Capitol Hill. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., takes an aggressive interest in Ingalls, based in his hometown. And Secretary Cohen spent years protecting the Bath shipyard while a Republican senator from Maine.

U.S. weapons firms look to S. America

Philadelphia Inquirer
Apr. 20, 1998
Pg. 1

Clinton pitched fighter jets in Chile after ending the weapons embargo. Not everyone is pleased.

By Michael D. Towle
Inquirer Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON -- President Clinton had been in Chile less than a day when he met with President Eduardo Frei and became a high-powered pitchman for American fighter jets.

Administration officials said Clinton told Frei last week that if Chile was going to buy new fighters to modernize its aging fleet, he hoped they would be F-16s built by Lockheed Martin Corp. or F-18s made by Boeing Co.

Chile, like other South American nations, is considering a major weapons buy from U.S. arms makers now that the administration has lifted a 20-year ban on weapons sales to South American nations.

White House national security adviser Samuel R. Berger said Clinton "made it clear" that, "in the case of Chile and its plan to modernize its air force, the United States would be very interested in participating in that."

Clinton's decision to lift the arms embargo has set off a burst of marketing by American defense contractors enthusiastic about the prospect of a burgeoning new market.

Some industry analysts

predict that Chile, Brazil and Argentina may be ready to buy as many as 200 new fighters over the next decade and dozens of military helicopters.

"There is a sizable likelihood that a number of these countries there will buy more modern combat aircraft, F-16s, or F-18s, or whatever," said Wolfgang Demisch, a defense industry analyst with Bankers Trust in New York.

Chile is considering buying up to 24 fighters, a deal worth up to $1 billion for Lockheed Martin. Chile has narrowed its choices to the F-16, F-18, the JAS-39 Gripen from Sweden, and the French-made Mirage 2000-5.

The F-16, Pentagon sources said, appears to be the frontrunner with its smaller price tag, $20 million to $25 million a copy. The F-18 could cost Chile as much as $10 million more per plane, meaning the country would get fewer aircraft for the $1 billion it wants to spend, analysts said.

A decision from Chile could come early next month. Some in the industry believe similar orders from other Latin American countries could be the salvation for a defense industry being buffeted by a Pentagon budget squeeze.

With sales in the United States likely stagnant and Asia in a financial crisis, South America is seen as a potentially fertile market that could reap billions for the U.S. industry over the next two decades.

The Pentagon is less enthusiastic about the market, believing most nations there will not spend nearly as much as some contractors believe. But some officials, including Defense Secretary William S. Cohen, want to see allies in the region using American-made equipment because it allows forces to more easily interact and because economies of scale from higher production would make those same weapons less costly for the Pentagon.

At the same time, some see the push from Washington as fueling an arms race in Latin America.

Tom Cardamone, director of the Conventional Arms Transfer Project at the Council for a Livable World, a 35-year-old arms-control group, said the region needed more books and computers, not guns.

"The problem is that, once the equipment is used, we don't have any more oversight," he said. "I think that there has to be some real serious thinking about the type of equipment, and the particular country requesting it, and their justification for requiring that type of equipment."

Cardamone suggested that arms sales could fuel a regional war.

Argentina, which shares a long border with Chile, has said it opposes Chile buying warplanes, but is expected to respond with its own purchase of weapons if Chile moves forward.

Philadelphia Inquirer April 20, 1998

NATO expansion splitting national security establishment

Critics say adding Eastern European nations will upset Russia. Backers say the plan will help stability.

By David Hess
Inquirer Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON -- For months now, senators have been conducting a surprisingly quiet debate over a treaty that would extend NATO to Eastern Europe.

Most Americans are not even aware of the issue, polls indicate, but critics on the right and the left have warned that the proposed security guarantee unnecessarily rattles Russia and carries a potentially high cost in American wealth and, possibly, lives.

"NATO is a military alliance, and any decision to extend the U.S. security guarantees is serious business, not cost-free political symbolism," said Ted Galen Carpenter, head of defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, a Libertarian think tank in Washington. "U.S. troops might very well die defending those countries."

That argument is likely to get a more public airing in coming days as the Senate prepares to vote on whether to bring Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary into NATO. Ten other countries, ranging from the three Baltic republics to Ukraine and Macedonia, also want in, but their bids must await a later time.

At least some of the impetus for expanding NATO membership comes from nationality groups in the United States that want the countries of their forebears gathered under the shelter of the West. For them, even a shrunken and weakened Russia remains a threat.

Although the prospective members have conceded that Russia poses no foreseeable threat, they view membership in NATO as a ticket to increased aid from the West. Several already have applied for inclusion in the European Union.

It appears likely there will be a sufficient majority in the Senate -- at least 67 votes are required to ratify or alter treaties -- to adopt the expansion proposal offered by President Clinton.

But the issue has driven a wedge in the ranks of America's national security establishment. Many foreign-policy analysts and scholars are questioning why the Senate and the President are trying to "fix" something that isn't broken.

"There are a lot of reasons why this is a bad idea," said Edward Rhodes, director of the Center for Global Security and Democracy at Rutgers University. "But in a nutshell, it all hinges on the fact the [Senate resolution] is a solution to a problem we are not facing and could create problems if it passes."

Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr. (D., Del.) and Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R., N.C.) are the Senate's chief proponents of the expansion resolution.

"Enlargement will extend the zone of stability and help eliminate the gray area in Central and Eastern Europe," Biden said. "Just the prospect of it already has stimulated internal reforms in Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic, and encouraged them to resolve historic disputes with their neighbors."

But opponents have argued that there is no current military threat in Central Europe that would warrant spending the money to expand NATO and offending Russia, whose cooperation is needed to further reduce nuclear arms and eliminate chemical weapons.

Michael Mandelbaum, a foreign policy expert at Johns Hopkins University, in Maryland, said NATO "is a military alliance. Russia is not a threat now, and NATO expansion is at best premature and at worst counterproductive."

U.S. relations with Russia were foremost in the minds of 17 former senators, spanning the political spectrum from conservative Republican Gordon Humphrey of New Hampshire to liberal Democrat Gary Hart of Colorado, who have written to the Senate opposing the expansion.

"We should concentrate on reducing Russia's arsenal of nuclear weapons and bringing Russia into the Western family of democratic nations," they asserted. "The tensions raised by expanding NATO toward Russia's borders can only make more difficult our effort to ensure Russian nuclear warheads do not fall into the hands of terrorists or rogue regimes."

Other critics have argued that a provoked Russia could make trouble for the West in other world hot spots, particularly Iran and Iraq, which are in the market for Russian arms and missile technologies.

Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen has insisted that Russia should not feel threatened.

Despite the Russian government's objections to the expansion, he said, his "private conversations" with Russian legislative leaders indicated it was not a "serious issue." And he maintained that the United States had made it clear to Russia that "we are willing to engage with them in a very constructive way" and expanding NATO "spreads stability in

ways that benefit them as well as us."

Cohen acknowledged that any further expansion, particularly to embrace Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia -- on Russia's doorstep -- would be met with stiff Russian opposition. Clinton has already promised that those Baltic nations would be considered later for inclusion in NATO, although other alliance powers (Britain, France and Germany) have not signed on to that pledge.

USA Today April 21, 1998 Pg. 9

RUSSIAN ARM SALES: Russia, the world's biggest arms exporter after the United States, plans to sell $3.5 billion worth of arms in 1998, $1 billion more than last year, the Interfax news agency said. Russian ships and naval arms will be the biggest export item, amounting for 18% of total exports. Russia sees the export of arms and military technology as a major contributor to its national budget. It also believes increased arms exports could help its financially strapped military sector.

International Herald Tribune April 21, 1998

Try New Thinking for Strengthened UN Peacekeeping

By J.J.C. Voorhoeve
International Herald Tribune

THE HAGUE - Give the United Nations the tools, Kofi Annan rightly argues, ''and we will do the job'' (IHT Opinion, March 10). The transformation of UN peacekeeping operations is one of the world's most important jobs today.

UN peacekeeping can be compared to a roller-coaster ride. From heights of optimism in the early 1990s, the United Nations plummeted in popularity after fumbled operations in Somalia, Rwanda and Bosnia.

A dramatic re-evaluation of UN peacekeeping has taken place. And the United Nations has mostly opted out of peace-enforcement operations.

Will the United Nations' role as a peacekeeper further dwindle to the point of becoming irrelevant? Not if member states draw the right conclusions from past experience.

The limitations of UN peacekeeping have become clear.

Diplomatic and military prevention of conflicts requires a political courage that is not always easy to muster up.

The outcome of humanitarian intervention may be mixed. Many people may benefit from the assistance, but the causes of the conflict are not addressed, and a comprehensive political strategy to resolve the conflict is not developed.

"Soft peacekeeping" does not dissuade warmongers from using force, nor from terrorist acts and genocide. So a peace operation must be backed up by formidable military means.

In post-conflict peace-building, the United Nations is challenged to create a stable social, economic and political infrastructure.

What steps need to be taken to ensure the viability and credibility of multinational peace operations in the future? Three approaches can be discerned: flexible response, rapid reaction and phased withdrawal.

Flexible response: Most peacekeepers currently deployed in peace operations, although almost invariably under a UN mandate, do not operate under a UN flag. The best examples of how regional organizations or ad hoc coalitions, better equipped to deal with peace enforcement operations, may be able to step in where the United Nations cannot or will not act itself are the NATO-led Implementation Force (60,000 toops) and its successor Stabilization Force (35,000) in Bosnia.

Regional capacity to deal with peacekeeping and peace-building efforts ought to be strengthened. Large-scale military operations must be carried out by a coalition of the willing, led by a major nation or a regional military organization.

The United Nations may find its niche in classical tasks such as interpositioning of forces or conflict prevention and post-conflict peace-building.

Rapid reaction: The past few years have proved the need for the United Nations to be able to react swiftly, for instance when a humanitarian crisis unfolds. The very existence of an effective rapid reaction capability could affect in a positive way the dynamics and scope of certain limited, regional crises.

Rapid reaction capacity requires political will (speedy national and international decision-making), military readiness and strategic transport. If one of these elements is absent, the others lose relevance.

Initiatives like the UN Standby Arrangements System do serve to keep the importance of timely reaction on the political agenda, and may contribute to a more adequate reaction by the UN member states.

Phased withdrawal: A robust force may first have to enter, followed by a peacekeeping force. Alternatively, military units may leave altogether once the situation has been stabilized, while aid agencies, military observers and police remain to assist in post-conflict peace-building.

Components of present-day peace operations need to be sufficiently available. And serious thought should be given to a UN Standby Police Force.

In conclusion, multinational peace operations, despite their current limitations and unpopularity, will remain relevant to help maintain a certain degree of world order. As the international community learns how to cope with the present international security environment, some of the tenets of future peacekeeping can already be discerned in the changing nature of today's operations.

We face a dilemma. If too many peace operations fail, the United Nations will lose credibility. But if UN members are too cautious in intervening to stop large-scale bloodshed, the organization loses relevance.

Defeatism and cynicism are not the way to react. Neither is blind faith. The reaction should be a constant endeavor to reinforce the United Nations.

The writer is minister of defense of the Netherlands. He contributed this comment to the International Herald Tribune.

Washington Post April 21, 1998 Pg. 14

Iraq, Iran Discuss Final Prisoner Exchange

BAGHDAD, Iraq—Iraq and Iran yesterday began discussing a final prisoner exchange at an Iraqi border post, another sign of increasing friendliness 10 years after their eight-year war ended.

More than 10,000 Iraqis are still in captivity in Iran, according to Iraq, which maintains it is not holding any Iranian POWs. But an Iranian diplomat said Abdullah Najafi, chairman of Iran's commission for POWs, presented documents to Riyad Qaisi, a deputy Iraqi foreign minister, about Iranians it believes are in Iraqi jails. He did not give a figure.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON , WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski **NEWS DIRECTOR:** Taft Phoebus **EARLY BIRD EDITOR:** Linda Lee
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe **ADMINISTRATION:** Wendy Powers **PRODUCTION:** Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)